

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1837.

ART. I.—*Novalis Schriften. Herausgegeben von L. Tieck und F. Schlegel.* Berlin. 1826.—*The Writings of Novalis. Edited by L. Tieck and F. Schlegel.* Berlin. 1826. 4th Edit.

NOVALIS belonged to that brilliant society, consisting, besides himself, of Tieck and the two Schlegels, which, at the commencement of the present century, produced a mighty revolution in German literature; and has exerted an influence not more extensive than beneficial on the German mind. If “new and purer views of art”* have been established—if the progress of that literary Paganism which Lessing, and Herder, and Voss, and Göthe, had encouraged and promoted, hath been happily arrested—if while the fullest justice hath been rendered to the claims of antique genius, the long-neglected art and literature of the Middle Age have regained their hold on our sympathies and admiration—if, as in the case of Novalis and F. Schlegel, the foundations have been laid for a Christian school in history and metaphysics—it is by the illustrious men we speak of, that these benefits have been achieved. And if to these we add the name of Stolberg, for the department of theology and ecclesiastical history, we have then named the five Promethean spirits that in our age brought down new fire from heaven, and recast, as it were, the mould of the German mind.

In this article it is our intention to review the interesting biography of Novalis, which Tieck has prefixed to the fourth edition of his friend's writings; next among those writings we shall particularly call the reader's attention to a beautiful historical fragment, entitled “Christendom,” as well as to many of his detached thoughts on religion, literature, and politics; and we shall conclude with a short parallel between him and his most distinguished literary friend and associate.

Frederick von Hardenberg, called Novalis, was born on the 2nd of May, 1772, on a family estate in the Countship of

* Wiseman's “Connexion of Science and Revealed Religion.”

Mansfeld. His father, the Baron von Hardenberg, was director of the salt-mines of Saxony. He was a member of the community of *Hernhutters*; and was distinguished as much for his frankness and liveliness of character, as for his virtue and piety. His wife belonged to the same religious community, and was a pattern of domestic virtue. The occupations of her husband often occasioning his absence from home, the care of directing her children's education devolved upon her; and this trust she executed with a zeal and an intelligence, crowned by Providence with the best success. Novalis was the second of eleven children. In his first years he was very weakly, very quiet and retiring in his manners, giving no indication of particular talent, and remarked only by his peculiar fondness for his mother. On recovering from a dangerous illness, which he experienced in his ninth year, he became more lively and active, and evinced greater aptitude for learning. At twelve years of age, he already possessed a pretty tolerable knowledge of Latin, and some acquaintance with Greek; and his biographer informs us, that at that early period he composed some pieces of poetry, which are to be found among his papers.

From this time his application was unremitting; and history, especially, he read with uncommon avidity. In the year 1790, he went to study at the University of Jena; and in 1792 visited, with his brother Erasmus, the University of Leipzig. There he remained till the following year, when he repaired to the University of Wittenberg, and there completed his studies.

"At this time," says his distinguished friend and biographer Tieck, "he made the acquaintance of Frederick Schlegel, whose warmest friend he soon became; he also came to know Fichte, and these two spirits exerted a great and permanent influence on his whole life. The philosophical system of Fichte he studied after some time with unwearied zeal. When he had quitted Wittenberg, he went to Arnstadt in Thuringia, in order to initiate himself in affairs of public business under the director of the Circle, Just. This excellent man soon became one of his most confidential friends. It was not long after his arrival in Arnstadt, that on a neighbouring estate he was introduced to Sophia von K——. The first view of this fair and surprisingly lovely creature decided his destiny; nay, we might almost say, that the deep lasting impression she made on his soul, formed the tenour of his whole existence. Even in the forms of infancy, there is at times an expression, which, as it is too sweet, too spiritually lovely, we call unearthly or heavenly; and these luminous and almost transparent faces usually excite an apprehension, that they are too tender, too delicately framed for this life, and that it is death or immortality which from those brilliant eyes gazes on us so significantly. And too often doth a rapid decay realize our fearful anticipations. Still more

captivating are those forms when they have happily passed infancy, and when they bloom in the first years of maidenhood. All those who have known the charming creature, the object of our friend's affection, concur in stating, that the grace and heavenly sweetness which encompassed this unearthly being, the beauty which shone about her, and the interest and majesty wherewith she was invested, exceeded all power of description. Novalis became a poet as often as he spoke of her. She had concluded her thirteenth year when he first became acquainted with her; the spring and summer of 1795 was the most blooming period of his life; every hour which he could snatch from business he passed in Grüningen, and in the autumn of that year he received from Sophia's parents the promise which was to decide his future destiny. Shortly after, Sophia fell dangerously ill of a fever, accompanied with stitches in the side; and although after some weeks she recovered, still the pains in the side continued, and by their extreme acuteness marred many a fair hour. Novalis was deeply affected by the illness of a creature he so much idolized; yet the assurance of her physician that these pains were not of a serious nature, tended to remove his uneasiness."—*Life*, p. 11-12.

Soon after her recovery, Novalis repaired to Weisenfels, and was appointed auditor in the department in which his father was director. The winter of 1795 found Novalis engaged in his new official pursuits, and enjoying the beloved society of his parents, and brothers, and sisters. The letters which he received from Grüningen gave him the most satisfactory accounts of Sophia's health; and he now confidently looked forward to a speedy union with the object of his most ardent affections. Alas! too soon were these pleasing hopes destined to be blighted. In the summer of 1796, Novalis received the distressing intelligence that Sophia had been obliged to repair to Jena to undergo a dangerous operation for an abscess on the lungs. He hastened thither to meet her. Her medical attendant gave him reason to think that her recovery would be slow. It was found necessary to repeat the operation; and this, the physician feared her feeble frame would be incapable of enduring. She languished for many months in a state of great debility, enduring all her sufferings with a heavenly fortitude and resignation. At last, on the 17th of March, 1797, this interesting creature expired in the arms of her sister, and of her faithful and affectionate governess, a Madlle. Danscours.

These melancholy tidings his brother Charles ventured, after some difficulty, to convey to Novalis.

"The latter," says his biographer, "secluded himself, and after three days and nights of weeping, repaired to his faithful friends at Arnstadt, in order to be near the spot which contained the remains of all he most valued on earth."

Among his writings we have found a beautiful letter, which he addressed to a friend on the death of Sophia. We shall take the liberty to translate one of the most interesting passages:—

"It is my melancholy duty to convey to you the intelligence that Sophia is no more. After indescribable sufferings, which she endured with the most exemplary fortitude, she expired on the 17th of March, at half-past ten o'clock in the morning. She was born on the 17th of March, 1783, and on the 15th of March, 1795, I received from her the assurance that she would be mine. Since the 17th of November, 1795, she has been suffering. Eight days before her death I left her, with the strongest conviction that I should never again see her. It was beyond my power to remain an impotent spectator of the painful struggles under which youth in its first bloom succumbed—to witness the fearful anguish of this celestial creature. This fate I had never apprehended. It was but three weeks ago that I first perceived its threatening. Evening has closed around me, while I was yet looking for the dawn. My grief is as boundless as my love. For three years she was my hourly thought. She alone attached me to life, to my country, to my occupations. With her I am severed from all things, for I have almost lost my very self."—*Works*, p. 209.

This heart, so true, so devoted in love, was, as our readers may suppose, open to all the kindly feelings of fraternal affection.

His brother Erasmus, who had been long ailing, Novalis had the misfortune to lose on the 14th of April, 1797, about a month after Sophia's death. In a letter, which he addressed on this melancholy occasion to his brother Charles, who was absent on a journey, he writes as follows: "Be comforted, Erasmus hath triumphed; the flowers of the lovely wreath have detached themselves here, only to grow into a fairer and immortal crown above."

"At this period," says his biographer, "Novalis lived only for his grief: it had become natural to him to consider the visible and invisible world but as one, and to separate life and death only by his desire after the latter. For him existence assumed a glorified aspect, and his whole life flowed along as in a clear conscious dream of a higher state of being. The sanctity of grief, deep inward love, and pious aspirations after death, pervaded his whole being and all its creations: nay, it is very possible that it was this period of profound sorrow which sowed in his constitution the germs of death, were it not already his predestined fate so early to be snatched away from us."—*Life*, p. 14.

After having passed some weeks in Thuringia, he returned consoled to his occupations, which he prosecuted with more than ordinary zeal. At this time he composed many of those literary and philosophical fragments, of which we propose giving some interesting specimens, before we conclude this article. In the

year which followed, he formed the acquaintance of his biographer, Tieck—an acquaintance which soon ripened into the most lasting friendship. Tieck speaks of the many happy hours which he passed in his society, as well as in that of Schelling, Ritter, and the two Schlegels, who then formed a brilliant assemblage of talent at Jena.

About this time he became acquainted with Julia von Ch——; and his biographer makes a sort of apology, that he should have been affianced to her a year after the demise of Sophia.

"Sophia," says he, as we see from Novalis's works, "still remained the centre of his thoughts—in death she received from him a worship almost more devoted than when she was yet visible; but he thought beauty and amiability might in some degree compensate the severe loss he had sustained."—*Life*, p. 15.

This defence is not sophistical. These generous natures yearn for sympathy; and reciprocity of affection is, as it were, a necessity of their being. Hence, when death has deprived them of the objects of their first deep enthusiastic love, it is in new affections they seek the solace of a grief, otherwise too poignant for human endurance; and they search in other beings for a reflection, however faint, of the charms which first captivated their feelings. It is thus, when the glorious sun hath gone down, we love to watch the glowing clouds, that give back, however feebly, the varied splendour of his setting beams.

It was at this period, Novalis composed his beautiful romance of "Ofterdingen," wherein, as in a clear mirror, are reflected all the feelings, the aspirations, the projects, and the occupations of his own life. It was intended, as he himself says, to be "an apotheosis of poetry." On this romance, as well as on the poetry of Novalis, we regret that our limits will not permit us to enlarge at present; but perhaps we may find another occasion to bring his poetical productions before our readers. Our main business at present is with his historical and philosophical writings, or rather fragments, which the hand of death prevented him from finishing.

His religious poetry, especially his hymns to the Blessed Virgin, are full of grace, tenderness, and piety. There are also many beautiful poetical pieces scattered through the romance we have just spoken of. Among these, we may notice in particular the Song of the Miner, in celebration of the toils and pleasures of his craft.

On a visit which Tieck in the summer of 1800 paid to his friend, he found him observing a vegetable diet, in order to guard against the danger of decline. His spirits were good, but his increasing paleness and emaciation inspired his relatives with

much anxiety. From this period his health rapidly declined. He was compelled to put off his marriage, which was to have taken place in the autumn of the above-mentioned year. The sudden death of a younger brother, which occurred at this time from drowning, so much affected him, that a violent hæmorrhage ensued: whereupon his physician declared his malady to be incurable. In proportion as his debility increased, so his desire to enjoy the milder climate of a southern country became more ardent; but this wish his medical attendant was compelled to oppose, as his strength was inadequate to the fatigues of the journey. In January, 1801, his desire to rejoin his parents becoming more intense, he could not refrain from repairing to Weissenfels.

"The nearer he approached his end," says his biographer, "the more confidently he looked forward to a speedy recovery; for his cough was less troublesome, and, with the exception of languor, he had no feeling of disease. With the hope and desire of life new talents seemed to awake within him; he revolved with new affection all his literary projects: he proposed to write anew his romance of 'Ofterdingen'; and shortly prior to his death, exclaimed on one occasion, 'Now only have I learned what poetry is; countless lays and poems quite different from any thing I have yet written, occur to my mind.' From the 17th of March, the anniversary of the death of his Sophia, he became visibly weaker: many of his friends visited him; and it was a source of great joy to him, when, on the 21st of March, his faithful and earliest friend, Frederick Schlegel, came from Jena to see him. With the latter he conversed much, especially on the subject of their mutual labours. In those days he was very lively, and his nights were calm: he also enjoyed a tolerably sound sleep. On the 25th, about six o'clock in the morning, he begged his brother to hand him some books for the purpose of consulting some passages; he then ordered his breakfast, and spoke with cheerfulness until eight. About nine he requested his brother to play some tune for him on the piano, whereupon he fell asleep. Frederick Schlegel entered soon after into the room, and found him in a calm sleep: this sleep lasted till twelve o'clock, when, without the slightest convulsion, he departed this world, and, unchanged in death, preserved that wonted cheerful mien which had ever characterized him in life.

"Thus died, before he had completed his twenty-ninth year, our excellent friend, in whom all must esteem and admire as well his extensive knowledge and philosophical genius, as his poetical talents. As he was so much beyond his age, his country might have expected from him extraordinary things, had he not been carried off by a premature death: still, the unfinished writings he has left behind have already exerted much influence; and in future times his mighty conceptions will stir up enthusiasm in many a breast, and generous spirits and deep thinkers will feel themselves enlightened and enkindled by the sparks of his genius."—*Life*, p. 19-20.

Of the person of Novalis, his biographer gives the following interesting account :

"Novalis was tall, slim, and finely proportioned. He wore his light-brown hair in descending curls, which then was less singular than it would be now : his hazel eye was clear and brilliant, and the complexion of his face, especially his intellectual brow, was almost transparent The outline and expression of his face nearly resembled that of St. John the Evangelist, as represented in the fine large painting by Albert Dürer, which is preserved at Munich."—*Life*, p. 20-21.

Tieck then gives the following just estimate of his friend's genius. It will be seen that Novalis's pursuits in one respect differed materially from those of his literary associates. The fine arts, to which *they* devoted so much of their attention, *he* comparatively neglected ; while, on the other hand, the physical sciences were an especial object of his predilection. But in these he sought rather the beautiful, the significant, and the mysterious, than the useful. Nature to him was a divine epos, containing every species of poetry, the sublime and the elegant, the sober and the fantastic, the tragic and the gay.

"His regular studies had been for many years philosophy and physics. In the latter, his perceptions, anticipations, and combinations, often went beyond his time. In philosophy he had particularly studied Spinoza and Fichte ; but he afterwards struck out for himself an original path, by labouring to unite philosophy with religion ; and so the fragments which exist of the New Platonists, as well as the writings of the Mystics, were in this respect of great importance to him. His knowledge in mathematics, as well as in the mechanical arts, especially mining, was considerable. On the other hand, in the real or higher arts, he had taken but slight interest. Of music he was very fond, although he possessed but a superficial acquaintance with it. To sculpture and painting his attention had been but little drawn, although upon all these arts he could express the most original ideas, and the loftiest perceptions. Thus I remember a discussion we had upon landscape-painting, in which I could not coincide with his views ; yet these views I afterwards found in a great measure realized by the excellent landscape-painter, Frederick of Dresden, out of the rich stores of his poetical genius. In poetry he was quite as much a stranger—he had read but few poets, and had paid little attention to criticism, and the ordinary systems of poetical art.

"Thus, uncontaminated by examples, he discovered a new path of poetical representation ; and in the variety of his views, in his conception of love, and faith in love, which was at once his teacher, his philosophy, and religion—in the fact that his whole poetry and all its meditations are coloured by one great event of his life, by a deep sorrow for a mighty loss, he alone resembles, among all moderns, the

sublime Dante; and like him he sings an unfathomably mystic song, very unlike that of many imitators, who think mysticism an ornament, which they can put on and take off at pleasure."—*Life*, p. 22-23.

But it is now time to introduce our readers to the writings of Novalis. Among these, one of the most important, and to Catholic readers perhaps the most interesting, is the small historical fragment adverted to above, entitled *Christendom*, and which was composed in the year 1799. This may truly be termed a literary bijou; and small as it is, yet so excellent in form and matter, it would alone have established the author's reputation. When we consider the amiable feelings with which it abounds, the tone of religious earnestness that pervades it, the originality and loftiness of many of its views, and the signal fulfilment which several of its predictions have received in our times, we are tempted to weep over the untimely fate which bereaved the world of this excellent and highly gifted young man. It is interesting, also, to trace in this little work the struggle between early prejudices on the one hand, and the spontaneous suggestions of awakening independent reason on the other—between the writer's hereditary Protestant notions on the one side, and his self-formed Catholic opinions on the other.

We shall first give a rapid outline of its contents, and then extract the most interesting passages.

The author commences with the early ages of Christendom, and celebrates the beauty and holiness of worship in the Catholic Church, as well as of many of its religious rites and practices; the admirable constitution of her hierarchy, together with the zeal, the virtues, and the talents that adorned it; and, lastly, the services which the clergy of those times rendered to the cause of human happiness and civilization. He then shows how a false security had introduced into the clerical order mental inertness and moral laxity; and how the clergy gradually lost the respect and confidence of the laity, till the abuses in the Church at last provoked that great reaction called the Reformation. In his opinion, the evils which that event produced far outbalanced the blessings of which he thinks it was the parent. The essential errors inherent in Protestantism, considered as a religious system—its utter inability to accomplish a moral and political regeneration of Christendom,—are described with brief, but vigorous strokes. Then follows a masterly sketch of the infidelity of the eighteenth century, which is shown to be only a natural filiation of Protestantism. The dawn of a more propitious era for religion and humanity, which in the year 1799 was still so faint and uncertain, did not however escape the penetrating eye

of Novalis. The better direction which literature and philosophy, particularly in Germany, were just then beginning to take, filled him with the most cheering hopes. He concludes his interesting little treatise with the confident persuasion, that the period was not distant, when all Christians would embrace in the bosom of Catholic unity; when, under the divine influence of that Church, art and science, government and morality, would receive a magnificent regeneration; and the reconciliation and restoration of Europe prepare the way for the conversion to Christianity of the other portions of the globe.

Such is the tenour of this admirable little work, so extraordinary when we consider the youth of the author, and so far beyond the historical views and speculations of the time in which it was written. The historical literature of Germany had not then assumed that Catholic tone and spirit, which even in the hands of Protestant writers now frequently distinguishes it. The illustrious friend and associate of Novalis had not then directed his attention to the study of modern history. John von Müller alone, by his honest and generous feelings, his powerful understanding, and his great researches, had been enabled to catch the true spirit of the middle age. A little treatise, entitled *Travels of the Popes*, which this distinguished Protestant wrote in the year 1787, on occasion of the journey of Pius VI. to Vienna; and the object of which is to describe the most important political events connected with Papal journeys, contains, in its observations on the Catholic Hierarchy, and on the moral and political blessings which they conferred on mankind, many striking points of resemblance to the little writing under consideration.

The passages which we shall now proceed to cite, will convince the reader how far the praise bestowed on this treatise is founded in truth.

The author begins with describing the glory and happiness of those ages justly called the heroic ages of Christendom.

"Those were brilliant and glorious times, when Europe formed one Christian country, when one Christendom inhabited this civilized portion of the globe; and one common interest bound together the most remote provinces of this widely-extended spiritual empire. Without great secular possessions, one head guided and united the great political powers. A numerous corporation, to which every one had access, stood in subordination to this head, and executed his mandates, and zealously strove to consolidate his salutary power. Every member of this order was universally respected.

* * * * *

A filial confidence attached men to their instructions. How serenely could each one perform his daily task, when by these holy men a secure futurity was prepared for him, and every transgression was forgiven,

and every dark passage of life was blotted out and effaced. They were the experienced pilots on the great unknown sea, under whose guidance we might safely disregard all storms, and confidently expect a secure landing on the coast of our true country.

"The most savage, impetuous passions were compelled to bend with awe and submission to their words. Peace went out from them. They preached nothing but love for the holy marvellous Virgin of Christianity, who, endowed with a heavenly power, was prepared to rescue every believer from the most fearful dangers. They spake of long departed men of God, who, by their attachment and fidelity to that blessed mother and her divine child, had withstood the temptations of the world, had attained unto heavenly honours, and were now become tutelary and beneficent powers to their brethren on earth, willing helpers in their wants, intercessors for human frailty, and efficacious friends to humanity at the throne of God. With what serenity of mind did men leave the beautiful assemblies in those mysterious churches, which were adorned with heart-stirring pictures, filled with the sweetest odours, and enlivened by a holy and exalting music! In them were gratefully preserved, in costly vessels, the sacred relics of these venerable servants of God. And in these churches, too, glorious signs and miracles attested as well the efficacious beneficence of these happy saints, as the Divine goodness and omnipotence. In the same way as tender souls preserve locks of hair, or autographs of their departed loves, and nourish thereby the sweet flame of affection, down to the reuniting hour of death; so men then gathered with pious assiduity whatever had belonged to these holy souls, and every one esteemed himself happy, who could possess, or even touch, such consoling relics. Here and there the grace of heaven lighted down on some favoured image, or tombstone. Thither men flocked from all countries to proffer their fair donations, and brought back in return those celestial gifts—peace of mind, and health of body.

"This powerful but pacific society zealously sought to make all men participators in its beautiful faith, and sent forth its missionaries to announce everywhere the gospel of life, and make the kingdom of heaven the only kingdom in this world.

* * * * *

At the Court of the Head of the Church, the most prudent and most venerable men in Europe were assembled. Thither all treasures flowed: the destroyed Jerusalem had avenged herself, and Rome had become Jerusalem—the holy abode of God's government on the earth. Princes submitted their disputes to the arbitration of the common Father of Christendom, willingly laid down at his feet their crowns and their regal pomp, and esteemed it a glory to become members of the great clerical fraternity, and pass the evening of their lives in divine contemplation within the walls of a cloister. How very beneficial, how well adapted to the exigencies of human nature were these religious institutions, is proved by the vigorous expansion of all human energies—by the harmonious development of all moral and intellectual faculties, which they promoted—by the prodigious height which indi-

viduals attained to in every department of art and science—and by the universally prosperous condition of trade, whether in intellectual or material merchandize, throughout the whole extent of Europe, and even to the remotest India.”—*Works*, pp. 190-191.

We hold it to be the duty of a critic, not merely to exhibit with impartiality the opinions of the author whose work he reviews, but also, in important cases, where his opinions coincide with those of the writer, to support and defend them to the utmost of his ability. This is one of the most effectual means of imparting interest and utility to periodical literature, and of raising criticism above the routine of mere analysis. Accordingly we shall here venture to corroborate the opinions of our author on the Catholic hierarchy, by the testimony of two illustrious witnesses, one of whom, like Novalis, continued a Protestant, and the other, born a Protestant, had the happiness to be received into the bosom of that Church, for which, like Novalis, he had long entertained the most fervent love and admiration. The great Protestant historian, John von Müller, in the work already adverted to, *Travels of the Popes*, thus speaks of the services rendered by the Papacy to the cause of liberty and civilization.

“From the emancipated Guelphic cities of Italy, the arts and sciences poured their treasures into the hitherto barbarous life of the old Europeans. In them the charms of elegance were first felt—in them society assumed a more agreeable form. In republican institutions, in comprehensive measures of foreign policy, they took the lead: by means of navigation and industry, and without bloodshed, they united all parts of the world. To them manufactures owe their origin—in the system of exchanges they were the teachers—the imperial cities were formed on their model. It was to Pope Alexander III these cities were indebted for all their blessings. A superior they doubtless needed—but a military superior would have been formidable in victory, and ruinous in adversity.”* Again, he thus writes: “Gregory, Alexander, Innocent, raised a dike against a torrent which threatened to sweep over the earth. Here their paternal hands founded (*bauten*)† the hierarchy, and by the side of it established the freedom of states. Without the freedom of states, Rome might fall by the rescript of a despot—without the hierarchy, it was impossible to infuse into all nations uniformity of religious principles. Without the Pope, the Church had been

* “Reisen der Päpste,” p. 34-35.

† Here John von Müller speaks like a Protestant. It was Jesus Christ only who founded the hierarchy; but, under the grace of God, the above-named Popes consolidated it against the attacks of the secular power.

like an army, whose general was slain: Mayence, Treves, Cologne, the whole episcopal bench, the cathedral chapters, would have felt it to their cost. Without the hierarchy, Europe would have had no society; for the hierarchy (were it but for its own advantage) was compelled to watch incessantly over the general weal."*

Let us hear now the illustrious friend of Novalis, in that beautiful work, the first-fruits of his conversion, which he laid on the altar of the Church.

Speaking of the same period which Müller has just been characterizing, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Frederick Schlegel, in his *Modern History*, observes: "Of ignorance and a deficiency of mental cultivation, an age cannot with justice be accused, in which not only the Mediterranean sea (as in the most flourishing period of the Greeks), but even the remote Baltic, an object of terror to the ignorance of antiquity, were both covered with richly laden vessels, while their shores were studded with prosperous and powerful commercial cities—an age in which architecture took a new spring, and painting attained an unexampled height of perfection—wherein philosophy, almost too generally diffused, became a concern of life and of policy—wherein all the historical and literary knowledge within the grasp of the age was seized on with the most passionate avidity; and the physical and mathematical sciences were prosecuted and investigated with indefatigable labour, till those two great discoveries by which the human mind first attained its majority—the discovery of the New World and of the solar system—of heaven and earth in their true magnitude, at last crowned the inquisitive industry of ages."†

But to return to our author. He proceeds to state some of the causes which in his opinion prepared the way for the Reformation. These he finds in the abuse of learning—the degeneracy of philosophy—the intellectual superiority, which, owing to the supineness and tepidity of many of the clerical order, the laity had latterly acquired. Here he notices that law of fluctuation which governs human history, and which the illustrious Görres has since developed with such admirable talent. "Is there not," he asks, "a certain oscillation inherent in historic periods, and are they not subject to an alternation of opposite movements?" To this question he replies, "Yes, progressive, ever extending evolutions, these form the true matter of history."

* "Reisen der Päpste," p. 44.

† "Friedrich Schlegel über die neuere Geschichte," p. 220, 222. Wien, 1811.

Our readers must bear in mind, that however favourable the judgment which Novalis pronounces on the Catholic Church, he still contemplates it from the Protestant point of view. Accordingly they will not be surprised at the following passage, where, speaking of the Reformers, he says :

"They established a multitude of correct maxims, they introduced a multitude of laudable things, and abolished a multitude of corrupt opinions ; but they forgot the necessary result of their process ; they separated the inseparable, they divided the indivisible Church, and criminally severed themselves from the universal Christian society, by which and in which alone, a pure, permanent regeneration was possible."

Here we see the amiable Novalis still under the influence of early prejudices, confounding accidental abuses in the Catholic Church with its approved practices—a wild or extreme opinion of an individual doctor with the declared and recognized dogmas of our religion. Like every other great heresy, the Reformation doubtless provoked a salutary reaction in the minds of the faithful ; called the attention of the rulers of the Church to existing abuses, and awoke a general spirit of zeal, watchfulness, and activity ; and in this sense, and by this means, the Reformers may be said to have occasioned "a number of laudable things."

The destruction of religious unity, with which our author charges the Reformers, was not in his opinion remedied by the establishment of Consistories. These the secular princes took under their protection ; and glad enough were they to make the Protestant clergy feel the weight of their power. The interference of these sovereigns in ecclesiastical concerns ; the obstacles which they opposed to any general union of the Protestant Churches ; and the consequent confinement of religion within territorial limits, were, as our author observes, calculated to divest religion of its *cosmopolite* interest, and to annihilate that wholesome, tutelary, and *unifying* influence, which Christianity had once exerted over the nations of Europe.

The inherent defects of Protestantism are laid open with great skill, as well as boldness, in the following passage :

"This pure notion of religion was far from forming the basis of Protestantism ; but Luther in general treated Christianity in a most arbitrary manner, misapprehended its spirit, and introduced another religion,—namely, the holy *all-availableness of the Bible*,* and thereby, alas ! another extremely exotic and earthly science was mingled up in the concern of religion,—philology, whose destructive influence has

* "Die heilige Allgemeingültigkeit der Bibel."

been ever since but too apparent.* From a vague feeling of this error, Luther was by a great portion of Protestants raised to the rank of an Evangelist, and his translation of the Bible made canonical scripture.

"To the religious sense this philological spirit was extremely hurtful, for nothing so destroys its excitability as the dead letter. Prior to the Reformation, the broad outline, and rich, abundant materials of Catholic theology, as well as the esoteric preservation of the scriptures, and the holy authority of Councils and of Popes, prevented the dead letter from working so injuriously."—p. 195.

After lamenting the destruction of these antidotes, the author proceeds :

"Hence the history of Protestantism no longer exhibits any great splendid phenomena of super-mundane feeling or action—its commencement alone beams with a transient fire from heaven : soon afterwards, a dryness of the religious sense becomes perceptible. Worldly interests have obtained the ascendancy; the feeling for art sympathetically suffers; now and then a pure, eternal vital spark shoots forth, and a small community will coalesce. The spark becomes extinct, and immediately the community splits asunder, and swims down with the common stream. So it was with Zinzendorf, Jacob Böhme, and several others. The Moderatists have gained the ascendancy, and the period of a complete atony of the higher organs—of a general practical unbelief, is fast approaching. At the Reformation, Christendom was completely undone. Henceforth it cannot be said to exist. Catholics and Protestants, in their sectarian opposition, stood farther aloof from each other, than from Mahometans and Pagans.

"The states that still remained Catholic, continued to vegetate, not without imperceptibly feeling the injurious influence of the neighbouring Protestant countries. It was in the course of this period that the system of *modern politics* arose; and some powerful states sought to seize, and convert into a throne, the vacant chair of universal umpirage."—p. 195-196.

After reprobating the encroachments, which, during this period, some Catholic princes ventured to make on the jurisdiction of the Church—their haughty disregard to the religious feelings of their subjects, and their audacious attempts to throw off the yoke of Papal authority, our author gives the following spirited sketch of the Society of Jesus. In the eulogium which

* In a work which the celebrated Protestant philosopher Schelling published, about twenty years ago, there is a passage containing a striking coincidence of view with the opinion expressed by Novalis. "So we shall be compelled to seek in philology, as it is called, for the palladium of orthodoxy. And thus in the room of a living authority, the authority of dead books written in dead languages will be established; and as this from its very nature cannot be binding, a much more ignoble servitude will be the result."—*Vorlesungen über das akademische studium*, p. 200. (Lectures on academic studies, by Professor von Schelling.)

he pronounces on this illustrious order, there is one defect common to many Protestant admirers of the Jesuits—a too exclusive admiration, whereby that body of men are lauded at the expense of other members of the clerical order, and even of the very Church itself. The great society of Ignatius was indeed a powerful instrument in the hands of Divine Providence; yet it was but one among many means instituted by His merciful wisdom, in the sixteenth century, for checking the progress of heresy, spreading the light of faith in distant regions, improving public education, and reforming literature and science.

“Happily for the ancient Church, a new order arose, upon which the dying spirit of the hierarchy seemed to have poured out its last gifts, which infused a new energy into the old body, and with wonderful penetration and constancy, with a wisdom yet unexampled, undertook the defence of the Papacy, and sought its more vigorous regeneration. Never in the history of the world had such a society yet arisen. The Roman senate itself had not formed its plans for the conquest of the world with greater certainty of success. Never had a lofty idea been carried out into execution with more consummate intelligence. * * * A more dangerous rival the new Lutheranism could not have found. All the charms of the Catholic faith received fresh potency under its hands; into its cells all the treasures of science flowed back. What the Church had lost in Europe, this society sought to regain in other portions of the globe—in the most remote regions of the East and West: and the apostolic dignity and vocation it made peculiarly its own. In endeavours after popularity, its members were not behind-hand; and they well knew how much Luther had been indebted for success to his democratic arts, and to his attention to the common people. Everywhere they established schools, they sat in confessionals, they mounted the pulpit, and kept the press in activity; they became poets and philosophers, ministers and martyrs, and at the prodigious distance of America from Europe, and of Europe from China, kept up in respect to facts and doctrines, a most wonderful communication. Out of their schools they recruited their order with wise selection. * *

“To them alone are the Catholic states, and especially the Papal See, indebted for their having so long survived the Reformation: and who knows how old the world would still have looked, had the weakness of ecclesiastical superiors, the jealousy of princes, the jealousy of other religious orders, court intrigues, and other strange circumstances, not combined to check the bold career of this society, and with it to annihilate the last bulwark of the Catholic Church. That once formidable order now slumbers in obscurity and poverty on the confines of Europe, from whence perhaps it is destined, like the people* which affords it protection, with renovated power, and perhaps

* Novalis here alludes to the Russians, whose government afforded an asylum to the Jesuits, when they were expelled from all other European states. .

under another name, to spread one day over its ancient seats."—p. 196-198.

Here, we trust, our readers will agree with us, that the Jesuits have found a noble avenger for the insults, invectives, and calumnies, which, like the Divine Master whose name they bear, they have often to sustain from the children of the world. Honour, eternal honour to a society which has rendered such signal services to the cause of religion, humanity, and science; which is gratefully cherished and protected by the Catholic Church, and esteemed and honoured by the men most distinguished for learning and virtue in the Protestant world! But let not our admiration of one set of men blind us to the merits of another. The Jesuits, as we said before, were not the only combatants of heresy—the only resuscitators of piety, and reformers of abuses in learning or education, whom the sixteenth century produced. In that great and godly work of moral and intellectual regeneration, which was begun about the middle of the sixteenth century, and carried far down into the following age, many and various labourers co-operated.

Among these, we may name two religious institutes, whose foundation preceded that of the Jesuits, and whose members, by their example, as well as instruction, powerfully contributed towards the revival of piety, and the correction of abuses among all orders of men in Italy. These were the Theatines, established in 1524, by Gaetano da Thiene and Caraffa; and the Barnabites, founded somewhat later by Zaccaria, Ferrari, and Morigia. Both orders bore the name of *regular clerks*, and devoted themselves especially to preaching, administration of the sacraments, and visitation of the sick. Next, we may notice the order of the Samaschi, founded by Jerome Omelian, in the year 1532, and destined especially for the care and education of orphan children, and for obtaining asylums for female penitents. Two congregations, designed for imparting religious instruction to all classes, the one entitled "Fathers of Christian Doctrine," founded by Cæsar da Buss, in the year 1597, and the other established about the year 1562, by a Milanese nobleman, named Sadis Cusani, are entitled to a place in this enumeration.

In Lucca, a similar congregation was instituted in 1570, by a certain John Leonardi, after he had received the subdeaconship.

In the year 1548, the congregation of the priests of the Oratory, dedicated to the Holy Trinity, was founded by the celebrated St. Philip Neri. Its object was to promote devotional exercises among the clergy, and to advance theological science. To this learned and pious society, we are indebted for a Baronius,

a Raynaldi, and an Antony Gallonius. On the model of this society, Father Matthias Guerra established at Sienna, in 1567, a clerical congregation, called "The Society of the Sacred Nail." Preaching, administration of the holy sacraments, and catechising of children, formed the objects of this institute. A society of the same kind, called the Congregation of St. Joseph, and whose members bound themselves to administer the holy sacraments without receiving any pecuniary compensation, was founded at Rome in 1620, by Father Paul Motha. *The Piarists, or Fathers of Pious Schools*, were instituted at Rome in the seventeenth century, by a Spaniard, Joseph Calasanze, for training youth up in piety and science. It has spread its ramifications through Italy, Poland, Germany, and other countries.

Lastly, St. Charles Borromeo founded at Milan, in 1578, the Congregation of the Oblati, composed of secular ecclesiastics, and destined to minister at all times to the spiritual wants of his archiepiscopal see.

In imitation of the Community of the Oratory, founded by St. Philip Neri, Pierre de Berulle established in France, in the year 1611, the Congregation of the Oratorians, whose object, like that of many religious institutes we have mentioned, was the formation of a learned and exemplary clergy. From its bosom many celebrated writers have sprung. Among these, we may name the philosopher Malebranche; the orientalist, Morinus; the canonist, Thomassin; and the biblical critic, Richard Simon.

St. Vincent of Paul founded, in the year 1624, the Congregation of Missionary Priests, destined to aid the clergy in the discharge of their sacred functions, and to reanimate from time to time, by extraordinary missions, the piety of the people. In 1591, Camillo de Lellis founded the touching institute, entitled "The Fathers of a Good Death," whose duty it was to aid the infirm poor, and to administer consolation to the dying.

In the year 1618, Dom Didier de la Cour established a reformed Congregation of Benedictine monks, under the name of "Maurist Monks." This congregation possessed many abbeys and priories in France. The most learned Benedictines, such as Dom Montfaucon, Dom Mabillon, Dom Ruinart, Dom D'Achery, Dom le Nourri, Dom Martene, Dom Martianary, have adorned its cloisters.

In the year 1525, Matthæus Bassi, afflicted at the relaxation of zeal and piety in the Order of St. Francis, and at the loss of that respect and influence which it once possessed, resolved to introduce a rigid observance of the rules of the founder. Accordingly, he obtained from Pope Clement V the sanction of his

new reforms, and, under the name of Capuchins, instituted an order of men, who, widely diffused over the whole Church, may well be called the "*Forlorn Hope* of Christianity," for in the discharge of the most laborious, the most irksome, and the most perilous services, their heroic devotedness to the Church and to humanity has been ever conspicuous.*

In this enumeration of religious orders, we have confined ourselves to those only which sprang up in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and we have excluded all mention of the female institutes, which, however, exerted a most important influence on religion. Nor have we noticed the mighty regeneration in public morals, effected during those ages by the individual efforts of some holy personages. The influence of a St. Charles Borromeo in the north of Italy; of a St. Theresa in Spain; and of a St. Francis of Sales and a St. Vincent of Paul, in Savoy and in France, nearly vies with that which entire orders have exercised.

This enumeration will suffice to prove what vigour, what fullness of life yet existed in the Catholic Church after all the losses she had sustained, and that the society of the Jesuits, however great might be its merits, and salutary its influence, was far from absorbing and concentrating within itself, as Novalis seems to insinuate, all the moral and intellectual energies of that Church. So far from the Jesuits being "the last bulwark of the Catholic Church," we may assert that never has the Divine aid been more abundantly lavished on that Church; never has she accomplished a more salutary change in the minds and feelings of men; never has Catholic genius achieved more splendid triumphs, particularly in the two countries where religion had been most violently assailed—France and Germany—than in the last thirty-seven years, during which, as is notorious, the influence of this order has been either absolutely null, or extremely feeble.

Our author proceeds to give the following sketch of the irreligious philosophy of the last century; a sketch in which a fine irony is united to a spirit of bold and vigorous generalization.

"The result of this modern way of thinking was called philosophy; and everything opposed to antiquity, especially every attack on religion, was included under that name. The original personal hatred to the Catholic creed was gradually turned into a hatred against the Bible,

* For this account of religious orders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, consult Ritter's "*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*," pp. 172-3, first Part; also pp. 207-17, second Part. See also Hortic's and Döllinger's "*Kirchengeschichte*," vol. iii. See also "*Die Römische Päpste*, von Ranke," vol. i. pp. 172-6. Helyot's "*Ordres Monastiques*," vol. viii. is the chief source from which the above-named writers have derived their information.

the Christian Faith, and finally, all religion. Nay, more, this hatred to religion, naturally and consistently enough, extended to all objects of enthusiasm: it stigmatized imagination and feeling; morality and love of art; the future as well as the past; debased man to the level of a mere physical being, bowed under the yoke of necessity, and converted the infinitely diversified music of the universe into the monotonous clapper of an immense mill, which, turned by the stream of chance, was a self-grinding mill, without miller or architect, a pure *perpetuum mobile*.

"One species of enthusiasm was, however, generously left to the poor human race, and indeed, made the indispensable criterion of all high intellectual refinement: this was an enthusiasm for this great, splendid philosophy, and especially for its priests, and its mystagogues. France was so happy as to be the seat and nursery of this new faith, which consisted of pure science. In the new Church, poetry was decried, yet poets were still found in it, who, for the sake of effect, made use of ancient ornaments, and ancient lights, yet thereby incurred the danger of warming the new system of the world with ancient fire. The more cunning members of this fraternity, knew immediately how to throw cold water on their hearers when they became warm. These new illuminators laboured incessantly to disenchant nature, the earth, the souls of men, and the sciences, of all poetry; to obliterate every trace of the holy; to vilify by their sarcasms the recollection of everything ennobling in human history, and to divest the world of all ornament and variety.

"In Germany, the business was carried on in a more skilful manner. The new enlighteners reformed the whole system of education; sought to give to the old religion a new, rationalist, and vulgar sense, while they carefully effaced from it all mystery and miracle. They exhausted all the resources of erudition, in order to cut off recourse to history, while they kindly endeavoured to exalt history itself into a good bourgeois household picture of domestic manners. God was made the passive spectator of this great affecting drama, acted by the learned; and was at its close, solemnly to entertain and admire the poets and the players! The common people were a peculiar object of predilection to these enlighteners, and they were fashioned by them into a polite enthusiasm; and thus a new European fraternity—the philanthropists and illuminés—arose. Pity that nature remained still so marvellous and inconceivable; so poetical and so infinite, in despite of all these attempts to modernize her! Did any ancient superstition in a higher world, or in what related thereto, emerge to the surface of society, a cry of alarm was immediately raised on all sides, and if possible, the dangerous spark was smothered in its ashes by philosophy and wit; still was toleration the watchword of these illuminators, and in France especially, was synonymous with philosophy.

"The whole history of this modern infidelity is extremely remarkable, and furnishes the clue to an understanding of all the prodigious events of our own times. * * *

Long would the celestial fire of religion have blazed forth; long would all the crafty plans of illuminism have been made void, had not the influence and oppression of the secular power come to their aid. But at the moment when discord sprang up among these rulers and these literati, when the whole fraternity of the enemies of religion became divided, religion necessarily arose as a reconciling and awe-commanding member; and this resurrection, should it even be still not so perceptible as we could wish, must be hailed and announced by every friend of Christianity. That the moment of her resurrection is arrived, and that the very occurrences which appeared most opposed to her re-animation, nay, which seemed to threaten her total destruction, have turned out to be the most favourable symptoms of regeneration, no historical mind will be disposed to question. True anarchy is the generative element of religion. Out of the annihilation of all existing institutions she raises her glorious head, as the new foundress of the world. * * *

"The spirit of God moves over the face of the waters, and a heavenly island emerges visible above the receding waves, to form the abode of renovated humanity."—pp. 199-201.

The author exposes the futility of all attempts on the part of the modern revolutionists, to construct a permanent system of government, partly, because they reject all the historical traditions, recollections, and institutions of the past; and partly, because they sever the state from all connexion with religion. After noticing some more cheering symptoms, which in France and elsewhere seemed to indicate a return of a better order of things—some faint glimmerings, which, amid the deep gloom of that period, appeared to announce the coming of a glorious day, Novalis turns to his own Germany, and hails with pleasure the better direction which German literature and German science were then beginning to take. How signally have his predictions been fulfilled!

"Of the other European countries, besides Germany, we can only predict, that with the *peace*, the pulse of a high religious life will begin to beat within them, and soon will absorb every worldly interest. In Germany, we can already point out with certainty the traces of a new world. Germany precedes the other European states with a slow but steady pace. While these are occupied with war, commercial speculation, and political factions, the German is industriously qualifying himself to take part in a period of higher civilization; and this steady progress must in course of time give him a great preponderance over others. In German science and art, we may perceive a vehement fermentation. A vast display of intellect strikes us on all sides. New and fresh mines are explored. Never were the sciences in better hands, and never did they excite at least greater expectations. Subjects are examined under all their various points of view; nothing

is left unsifted, uninvestigated, uncriticized. Everything has become matter for enquiry. Writers have grown more original, and more powerful: every ancient monument of history, every art, every science, finds friends and followers; is embraced with new ardour, and rendered more prolific. A matchless versatility; a wonderful profundity; a brilliant elegance; the most comprehensive learning, and a rich powerful imagination, are here and there found boldly united."—p. 203.

If from those blissful seats, which we trust it has now attained, the noble spirit of Novalis were to look down on his beloved country, surely it would experience a new joy on contemplating the happy fulfilment of these predictions. In the period which has elapsed since those prophetic words were written, the German literature and science have indeed achieved marvellous triumphs; triumphs which even in foreign countries are now recognized and celebrated. The fine arts have put forth an unwonted splendour to embellish and ennoble German life; while industry and commerce are daily pouring forth their treasures to minister to its convenience. In the sacred cause of national independence, the military prowess of Germany has been crowned with the most brilliant success: while, in despite of the jealousies and encroachments of arbitrary power on the one hand, and the wicked insane efforts of revolutionary democracy on the other, the cause of sound, temperate, constitutional liberty, has been making slow, but certain progress in Germany. Above all, that holy religion, after which Novalis had so ardently yearned, has been extending its influence, wider and wider over the land; and, while in many places, it hallows, pervades, and vivifies art, science, and policy, it has reacted on the Protestant world itself, and checked the progress of Rationalism, and awoke a feeling of piety, which will ultimately, we think, lead to the happiest results.

After some good observations on the new and better direction, which the natural sciences were then beginning to assume, our author turns to the political world, and makes the following admirable reflections. With what a calm, steady, piercing glance, does this youthful spirit look into the future! What serene wisdom, what noble moderation we find in his counsels! Youth is the age of petulant feelings, and rash, extreme opinions. Hence this very moderation; this tranquil self-collectedness of mind was not the least extraordinary quality of this precocious intellect.

"Let us now turn to the political spectacle which our times present. The old and new order of things are involved in a struggle: the weakness and defectiveness of former political institutions have been signally

displayed in many fearful phenomena. What if here, as in the sciences, a closer and more various intercourse and connexion between the European states may not be the object designed by Providence in this war! What if the hitherto slumbering energies of Europe may not be roused, Europe again be resuscitated, and a brotherhood of her nations be not at hand! Is the Hierarchy, perhaps, destined to form the ground-plot of this political edifice—the animating principle of this confederacy of states? It is impossible for the secular powers to establish themselves in a just equilibrium:—a third power, which is at once mundane and super-mundane, can alone solve this problem. Among the conflicting powers, no peace can be concluded—all peace is but illusive—a mere armistice. From the point of view taken by cabinets, and by vulgar opinion, no reunion is conceivable. Both the political parties, now engaged in conflict, possess mighty and necessary claims, and, impelled by the spirit of the age, they must bring them forward. Both represent inextinguishable energies inherent in the human breast. *There we find devotion to antiquity—attachment to time-honoured institutions—love for ancestral monuments, and the old glorious heritage of the State, and the joy of obedience: there the kindling feelings of liberty—the exalting hope of a more extended field of action—the charm of youth and novelty—unfettered intercourse with all our fellow-citizens—pride in the power of human exertions—satisfaction in the possession of personal rights, and the life-stirring sense of citizenship.* Let neither party hope to annihilate the other—all conquests are here unavailing, for the inward capital of every empire lies not behind earthly ramparts, and cannot be stormed.”—pp. 206-7.

These words, which in 1799 had such a fearful import, are far from having lost their application in our own times. Would to God, indeed, they could be everywhere heard! would to God, they could pass into the life and feelings of nations! Then what useless contests, what interminable civil broils, what bloody wars, what havoc, what misery, would the nations of Europe be spared! Then would the exclusive pretensions, the mutual arrogance, the impracticable projects, the wild exaggerated opinions of hostile political factions be moderated, controlled, and reconciled. Then, under the sanction of our holy Church, order and liberty would solemnize a sacred, indissoluble alliance—and from that alliance, contentment, industry, wealth, and learning, would spring to diffuse their blessings over nations.

After having described the political evils of the age, our author points out the remedy, and the only remedy, existing for them.

“Who knows whether there has been enough of warfare? But never will it cease, till the palm-branch be grasped, which a spiritual power can alone extend. So long will blood continue to flow over Europe, until nations shall become conscious of the fearful frenzy,

that urges them round in a vicious circle, and until touched and softened by celestial music, they shall return in motley crowds to their ancient altars, perform works of peace, and, on the reeking battle-plain, amid tears of joy, solemnize the festival of peace, the great repast of love. Religion alone can resuscitate Europe, can give security to nations, invest Christendom with new glory, and reinstate her in her old pacific functions."—p. 207.

After thus commenting on the political evils of his age, and on the remedies which the Church alone was capable of applying to them, our author concludes his interesting treatise with the following beautiful passage, wherein the excellence of our holy religion is celebrated, and its final triumph, not only in Europe, but throughout the universe, most unequivocally foretold.

"A vital Christianity was the old Catholic Faith. Its all-presence in life—its love for art—its profound humanity—the indissolubility of its marriages—its adaptation to human wants—its joy in voluntary poverty, obedience, and fidelity; as these are the primary traits of its institutions, so they undeniably stamp it as a genuine religion.

"The other portions of the globe await Europe's reconciliation and resurrection, in order to enlist under the banners of Christianity, and become members of this celestial kingdom. Must there not be soon in Europe a multitude of truly religious minds? must not all true friends of religion sigh to behold this heaven upon earth? and long to meet together, and attune a holy chorus of love?

"Christianity must again become living and efficacious, and must again form herself into a visible Church, without regard to territorial limits, that she may receive into her bosom all souls thirsting after divine truth, and become the mediator of the old and new order of things.

"She must again pour over nations her old horn of benediction. From the sacred womb of a venerable European Council, Christendom will spring up regenerated, and the great business of religious resuscitation will be conducted according to a divine, all-embracing plan."—p. 208.

We have dwelt so long on this charming little work, that we have small space left for noticing, as we promised, the author's miscellaneous thoughts on religion, politics, and literature. We shall commence with his æsthetic meditations, and extract a few of the most interesting specimens.

What boundless poetry is in the following!—

"It is not merely the diversified colours, the gladsome tones, and the warm air, which so enraptures us in spring:—it is the still prophetic spirit of infinite hopes—a presentiment of many joyous days, of the happy existence of multifarious creatures—the anticipation of higher and eternal fruits and flowers, and an undefined sympathy with a world cheerfully unfolding around us."—p. 129.

What a cluster of pearls are the following thoughts!—

“Sculpture, music, and poetry, stand in the same relation towards each other, as the epos, the ode, and the drama.”

“The romance is, as it were, the ‘Mythology of History.’”

“Sculpture and music are arts diametrically opposed. Painting forms a species of transition from the one to the other.”—p. 129.

What an admirable definition is the following!—

“The theatre is the *active* reflection of man upon himself.”—p. 166.

At the time when the passages we are about to cite were written, the poetry of Shakspeare had not been so deeply studied, nor was it so generally felt and understood, as in our times. Yet, after the many elaborate and profound criticisms, which the age has produced in England, France, and above all, Germany, the following remarks on our great English bard will, we think, be perused with pleasure and interest:—

“When we speak of the design and artificial structure of Shakspeare’s dramas, we must not forget that art belongs to nature, and is, as it were, only a self-contemplating, self-imitating, and self-forming nature. The art of a highly-gifted genius is very distinct from the artificial refinement of the mere reasoning spirit. Shakspeare was no calculator—he was no scholar—but he was a powerful, richly-endowed intellect, whose feelings and works, like the productions of nature, bear the stamp of thought, and in which the latest and acutest observer may still find new coincidences with the infinite organism of the universe, agreements with subsequent opinions, affinities to the higher energies and senses in humanity. Shakspeare’s writings are symbolical, and variously significant, simple and inexhaustible, like nature’s products; and a more unfitting name could not be applied to them, than to call them works of art, in the narrow, mechanical signification of that word.

“In the historical dramas of Shakspeare, there is a constant struggle between poetry and prose. Common life appears witty and dissolute, while the heroic life seems stiff and tragic. Low life is constantly opposed to high, sometimes in a tragic manner, sometimes by way of parody, and often for the sake of contrast. History (that is to say, history in the poetical sense) is represented in these pieces—history reduced to dialogue; precisely the reverse of real history; and yet history as it ought to be, prophetic and synchronical.”—pp. 136-7.

The following remarks on oratory are excellent:—

“In a true oration, the orator plays all parts, in order to create surprise, to consider his subject in a new point of view, to practise a sudden illusion on his hearers, or to work conviction on their minds. An oration is an extremely lively, ingenious, alternating representation of the inward contemplation of a subject. Sometimes the orator interrogates, sometimes he replies; next he carries on a sort of dialogue,

then he narrates; now he appears to forget his subject, in order suddenly to recur to it; now he feigns conviction, in order more cunningly to wound his opponent; now he puts on an air of artlessness, or courage, or pity; now he apostrophizes this subject, now that; sometimes it is a peasant he addresses, sometimes even an inanimate thing. In short, an oration is a *drama soliloquized*. It is only the natural, straight-forward orator, who deserves that name. The timid or declamatory speaker is no orator. The genuine oration is in the style of the high comedy, interwoven occasionally with passages of lofty poetry, but else running on in the clear, simple prose of common life."—p. 137.

Here follows a recipe of the ingredients which make up a poet:—

"To the poet are necessary a calm, attentive sense, inclinations which divert him from worldly business and petty concerns, and a state of life devoid of anxiety; also much travel, acquaintance with various descriptions of men; a rapid, intuitive apprehension, a happy memory, the gift of language, no tenacity to any one object, no stormy passions, but an expansive susceptibility."—p. 164.

What poet ever possessed the requisites and qualities of his art here laid down, in a more eminent degree than our great and amiable Sir Walter Scott?

Again:—

"The separation of philosophy and poverty is productive of mutual disadvantage. It is the sign of a diseased constitution."—p. 165.

"Poetry is the hero of philosophy. Philosophy exalts poetry into a principle—it teaches us the value of poetry."—*ibid.*

We shall now lay before our readers some extracts from our author's reflections on moral and metaphysical subjects.

What depth and beauty in the following reflection!

"The mysterious charm of the virgin—that which renders her so unspeakably attractive—is the presentiment of maternity, the anticipation of a future world, which yet slumbers within her, and is one day to spring out of her. She is the aptest emblem of futurity."—p. 179.

Again:—

"Marriage designates a new, a higher period of love—the social or the living love."—*ibid.*

All our author's reflections on marriage are characterized by singular purity and delicacy of feeling, and elevation of thought. It was a favourite topic, which the circumstances of his life had caused him deeply to meditate upon. The following is also characteristic:—

"Shame is a sense of profanation. Friendship, love, and piety,

should be mysteriously treated. It is only in very rare, confiding moments, we should speak of them. Many things are too tender to be thought of—many more, to be expressed.”—p. 184.

Some of the religious reflections are very beautiful. There is a deep pathos in the following passage :—

“ Martyrs are spiritual heroes. *Every man hath indeed his years of martyrdom.* Christ was the great martyr of the human race: through Him hath martyrdom first received its mysterious holiness and deep significancy.”—p. 196.

“ Our whole existence was intended to be one divine service.”—p. 194.

“ The Holy Spirit is more than the Bible. He should be our teacher in Christianity, not the dead, earthly, ambiguous letter.”—p. 197.

“ A certain degree of retirement appears necessary to foster the higher feelings within us; and hence a too extended intercourse with men will stifle many a holy seed, and chase away those gods, who fly the restless tumult of dissipated societies, and the pursuit of vulgar cares.”

“ It is among men we must seek for God. In human occurrences, human thoughts, and human impressions, the Lord of Heaven most clearly reveals himself.”

How well did Novalis express the yearnings of his own beautiful spirit in the following words !

“ Philosophy is the true home-sickness—the longing to return to our father’s house.”

The following, too, is very profound :—

“ Philosophy is fundamentally anti-historic—it proceeds from the necessary and the future to the real—it is the science of the general sense of divination—it explains the past from the future; while in history the reverse is the case.”

Novalis belonged, as our readers may have already observed, to that class of politicians, who in Germany are denominated adherents of “ *corporative* principles”—men who, alike averse to despotism and democracy, assert, against the disorganizing tyranny of either, the freedom and stability of all the great social corporations. The Catholic clergy, maintained in the full independent exercise of all their spiritual rights and jurisdiction—the amplest toleration for all dissenting sects—a royalty hallowed by religion, ennobled by historical recollections, deeply rooted in the affections of the people, not arrogantly encroaching, like the modern sovereignty, on the liberties and privileges of the other orders of the state, but preserving inviolate their legitimate rights and interests—an aristocracy zealous alike for the prerogatives of the crown and the liberties of the people,

representing in itself the glory of past ages, and yet constantly recruited by new infusions of popular talent, wealth, and virtue —lastly, a democracy, active, intelligent, free-spirited, devoted to the Church, attached to royalty, respecting the aristocracy, yet bold in the assertion of its own rights, at once regulated in its movements, and secured in its independence by well-organized municipal corporations: such constitute the object of the desires and efforts of the politicians we allude to. The most distinguished chiefs of this school, are, F. Schlegel, Görres, Stolberg, and Adam Müller; and when we were in Germany, we found these political principles generally advocated by the most zealous and enlightened Catholics of that country. On the other hand, the monarchical absolutism of Richelieu and Louis XIV, which found so many servile copyists among the continental sovereigns of the eighteenth century (however that system might often be ennobled by a paternal mildness of administration, and adorned with all the refinements of courtesy, and the elegances of literature), we find these honest Germans generally condemn and repudiate, as one injurious to the Church, fatal to liberty, and ultimately destructive to royalty itself. These political principles are adopted also by many enlightened Protestants, especially those who are versed in the history of the Middle Age, who have a strong leaning towards Catholicism, like John von Müller and our author himself. If the reader will be pleased to bear in mind the foregoing observations, he will then, perhaps, more easily perceive the drift of the following passages, which otherwise might appear obscure.

“The time will come ere long, when men will feel generally convinced, that no king can exist without a republic, and no republic without a king: that both are inseparable, like body and soul, and that a king without a republic, and a republic without a king, are words without meaning. Hence, with a genuine republic a king ever arose, and with a genuine king a republic.”—p. 172.

“The republic and the monarchy should be bound together by an act of union. There are several intermediate forms of government, which must necessarily be included in that union.”—p. 172.

“The state has ever been instinctively constituted according to the relative views and knowledge of human nature. The state has ever been a *macroanthropos*, or great man: the guilds were the members, or particular functions, of the body politic; the estates of the realm were its faculties. The nobility was the moral, and the priesthood the religious, faculties; while the literati constituted the intelligence, and the king the will, of the state. So that every state has ever formed an allegorical man.”—p. 174.

We shall conclude our extracts with the following passage, which is not more beautiful than it is true.

"A throne overturned is like a falling mountain, which incrushes the plains, and leaves ruins and a dead sea behind, where once were fruitful fields and joyous habitations."—p. 173.

In conclusion, we do not think we can form a better estimate of the character and genius of Novalis, than by comparing him with his illustrious friend and associate, Frederick Schlegel. Both had received from nature a vigour of imagination, and a depth and originality of understanding, rarely equalled; and these natural qualities were in both strengthened and matured by all the resources of learning. Both were endowed with the same amiable sensibility—with hearts open to every noble and generous impression; and both were distinguished for an earnestness of religious feeling, which in one was crowned with the possession of that truth, so long and so ardently sought after. Yet in these two spirits, so similar, so homogeneous, that they would seem as if cast by nature from the same mould, a difference is discernible. Novalis was more remarkable for subtilty of perception;—Schlegel for solidity of judgment. Both possessed perhaps the same wonderful versatility of genius; yet we very much doubt, whether, had the life of Novalis been spared, he would ever have attained that power of controlling and concentrating his forces on a subject—in other words, that mental harmony, which was Schlegel's most striking characteristic. In the mode and direction of their studies, there are also points of divergence. Novalis, with an impatient avidity, grasps at every branch of the tree of science; strives to embrace at once metaphysics, poetry, history, physiology, and mechanics, till his intemperate study, added to his bitter disappointment in love, undermines his naturally feeble constitution, and consigns him to an early tomb. Schlegel, on the contrary, devotes his youth to an almost exclusive study of philology, criticism, and art, never venturing on metaphysical speculations, till he has made himself well acquainted with preceding systems of philosophy, and, above all, become deeply imbued with the spirit of Plato. By this well-regulated application, he successively masters many departments of literature and science, and lays in stores of the most various learning, such as few men have ever possessed.

In respect to style, we shall not find in Novalis that beautiful clearness and elegance, that classical purity and dignity of language, which characterizes even the earliest writings of his friend, and for which he was probably indebted to his careful study of the Greek models. The style of Novalis is remarkable for poetical richness, variety, and a peculiar felicity of verbal combination; yet it is not unfrequently, especially in the didactic

pieces, disfigured by a technical obscurity of phraseology, or a too colloquial familiarity of expression. But these are defects, which, in his maturer years, he would in all probability have corrected.

In the life of these two distinguished friends, there was the same singular contrast. Schlegel threads his way carefully between the by-paths of Rationalism on the one side, and the fearful abysses of Pantheism on the other, till he at last gains the lofty mount, on which the temple of eternal truth is built. His less fortunate friend has hardly set his foot in the porch of the Catholic Church—he has caught but a distant glimpse of the glories which radiate from her sanctuary, and but indistinctly heard the celestial harmonies that resound within her walls, when he is snatched away by the pitiless hand of death. But we have every reason to hope, that that spirit so pure, so earnest in its inquiries after truth, has elsewhere attained the reward which was denied to it here; and that those mists of error, from which while on earth it had not wholly disengaged itself, have long disappeared before the glorious visions of eternity!

ART II.—*Deux Chanceliers d'Angleterre. Bacon de Vérulam et S. Thomas de Canterbury.* Par A. F. Ozanam. Paris. 1836.

“FOR three centuries,” says M. le Comte de Maistre, “history has been only one grand conspiracy against truth.” There are few, at this day, even among our own fellow-countrymen, that will not subscribe, in part at least, to this sentiment. The bitterness of polemics, which wasted Christendom from the beginning of the schism that disfigures the annals of the sixteenth century, could have afforded but little encouragement to the culture of true historic philosophy, even though it had not exercised itself in corrupting those sources from which alone such philosophy derives its nutriment. In truth, by far the greater number of modern historians, writing in those countries where the Reformation succeeded best in gaining an establishment, seem to have regarded this noble province of the human intellect in no other estimation, than as affording a convenient arena whereon to bait the suppressed remnant haply still clinging to the ancient faith of their common ancestors. For a while, too, the game was a safe one. To have vanquished his antagonist would have little served the Catholic, conversing as of

yore in the pressed arena, while from the multitude on every side around him was raised the shout, "*Christianos ad leones!*" Hence every undertaker of history, from David Hume up to Fox, the pseudo-martyrologist, had in his turn his sling at the proscribed—undisturbed save by the savage rejoicing of those for whose prejudices he wrote. The Catholics, on the other hand, were as dormant in this field of distinction as their enemies were active. While the latter sowed tares among the wheat, the former slept; and not till the fearful scenes of the last century, and the bloody triumphs of a superficial *philosophism* had intervened, were they warned of the inconceivable error which they had committed, in abandoning to the undisputed dominion of their foemen, among other domains of science, the very battlefield on which their claims upon the human race might have been vindicated with the least opposition, and the victory most honourably won. From time to time, beyond a doubt, there did appear a Catholic history of past or contemporaneous events; and now and then might be gathered from these works much that redeemed the historic character of the age, or gave presage of a better one to come; but the *incubus* of the Reformation, and the writers whom it had produced, lay heavy upon the literature of even the Catholic countries, and while many of their philosophers worshipped Locke, their historians seem to have paid court to Clarendon. And thus, despite the weighty folios and voluminous quartos which daily issued from the shelves of her booksellers, Europe saw herself without one single historian; and though she heard in every variety of style the chronicled narration of the various passages of her history, she found not in her sons that philosophy which alone could instruct her in the truths of which they were only so many examples. The body was there without the soul to animate it.

But these things are of the past. The supineness of Catholic talent was at length aroused to life and energy by the terrible encroachments of a new foe—the antichristian school of the eighteenth century. By a mysterious alchemy, the providence of God fails not to extract from the most hostile of elements the materials of good, and to transmute, into the means of usefulness, the measures which may have been intended by human presumption for the purpose of His detriment. And, even so, the thirst of research and advancement was indeed at first excited by the preaching of Encyclopædists, because it promised to conduct to the downfall of Christianity; but when that thirst had tasted of the stores which these supplied it, and had known their gall and scantiness, refusing to imbibe more of that instruction, it sought out the well-springs from which our first fathers drank, now

gushing forth again with the renewed vigor of a long pent flood; for thence only was it able to derive a stream of science which should more than satisfy the craving. It is not our purpose to enumerate the illustrious members of the galaxy of Catholic glory which now irradiates the realms of history, or of science in general, in the countries of the Continent. The names of a Le Maistre, a Bonald, a Chateaubriand, a Schlegel, and a Müller, are doubtless not the only names which are familiar to the reader of modern history. They form distinguished units of a phalanx which has wrested the empire of narrative from the hands of our foes, and has put to the rout the anti-Catholic misstatements and interpretations of the past, which, till now, had formed the chief safeguards of error and fanaticism.

It is with grateful feelings, too, that we are bound to add the circumstance, that this restoration of truth to the department of history is by no means the exclusive work of Catholic hands. The spirit of philosophic justice has animated some among the greatest of those minds, which, unhappily, walk not in religious unison with our own, to the noble labour of reparation to the "ages of faith," and of resistance to modern misrepresentation. For, besides M. Guizot in France, whose enlightened views upon the middle ages—that fertile topic of anti-Catholic declamation—are beginning, we are glad to perceive, to attract the attention of even our own reading public*,—there are other Protestant philosophers of history, such as Voigt, the able historian of S. Gregory the Seventh, and Hürter, the triumphant defender of Innocent the Third, who have nobly played their parts in the great historical atonement which we behold in progress. And though England cannot as yet boast of a single historic philosopher, properly so called, and has therefore been reduced to rely for the demonstration of the *word*, which is the key to her own annals, upon the labours of some of the great Continental leaders of the science—the masterly history† which Dr. Lingard produced—has won many to think at least more charitably of their own forefathers, and has persuaded into the field a host of historical treatises of all dimensions, more or less favourable to the cause which he himself was the first to vindicate with system and precision. Why should it not be so? The most touching memorials of the prowess of God's Church in every domain of merely human intelligence, throughout the ages of barbarism or feudality, are those which Catholic England

* A translation of M. Guizot's *Lectures on the Civilization of Europe* is now being published by Mr. Macrone.

† We hail with pleasure the appearance of a new edition of this excellent work, revised and augmented, in monthly volumes, with illustrations. When the publication shall be complete, we hope to have the pleasure of inserting a notice of it.

affords. The stately monuments of art which cover the sites of time-hallowed recollections—the political institutions—the municipalities—the lion-hearted honesty and sturdy independence which still characterize the Englishman—all these, in their turns, have been the offspring of the spirit which once gained for this island, among nations, in days when it was thought no disgrace to be Catholic, the highest meed of religious excellence.

"It is singular, that we have a letter addressed by one of the oldest popes to a sovereign of this kingdom, which, even if it be not allowed all the antiquity attributed to it, must yet be considered anterior to the Conquest, in which he expressly says, that the constitution and government of all the other nations of Europe are necessarily less perfect than that of England, because they are based on the Theodosian, or an originally heathen code, while the Constitution of England has drawn its forms and provisions from Christianity, and received its principles from the Church. It is remarkable, that, perhaps, no other country has such a steady administration of the laws, in consequence of the admission into it of that very principle, which corresponds to the unwritten or traditional code of the Church. For, besides the statute law of the kingdom, we have also the common law, that law of traditional usage now recorded in the decisions of courts, and in other proper and legitimate documents, precisely in the same manner as the Church of Christ possesses a series of traditional laws, handed down from age to age, written, indeed, now in the works of those who have illustrated her constitution and precepts, and demonstrated in every part of her system, but still differing from the Scripture much in the same way as the unwritten differs from the written law."*

Hence the reason—independently of the deposing power, to which we shall refer in the course of this article—of those remarkable coincidences which exhibit to us throughout the middle ages the continuous alliance binding the oppression of the subject with the persecution of the Church. Hence we remark the sufferings of religion under the mailed grasp of the Norman race, universally responded to by the groans of an oppressed people. Hence the impious revelries of Rufus, the bloodstained schisms of Henry Plantagenet, and the apostacy of Sansterre. And, on the other hand, in the minds of the depressed people, the sense of their own wrongs was aggravated by their sympathy with the sufferings of religion, and their appeal to liberty consecrated by the recollection of those at whose hands they had first received it. "Give us," was the cry of the Saxon race, "give us the laws of good Saint Edward the Confessor." And the cry was caught up and repeated by such of their Norman intruders, and they were many, as had learned to identify themselves

* Dr. Wiseman's "Lectures on the Doctrine and Discipline," &c. Vol. i. p. 116.

with the memories of their adopted land, and to love her usages; and thus, as is well remarked by the young and generous champion of Faith, who is, not the less, the learned and eloquent friend of universal freedom—the Comte de Montalembert*—did Stephen Langton “place himself at the head of the barons revolted and united in the *army of God and Holy Church*, who tore from the king the celebrated great Charter—base of that English constitution which moderns have so much admired; doubtless forgetting that it was but the fruit of the feudal organization; and that this very charter, far from being an innovation, was but a restoration of the laws of St. Edward, a confirmation of the public law of all Europe at that epoch, founded upon the respect for all rights ancient and individual. * * *

And the nation completed the establishment of its liberties, under the conduct of the noble son of Simon de Montfort, brave and pious as his father—vanquished and slain at the end of his career, but not before having made a crusade of this popular war, and having introduced the deputies of the people into the first political assembly which ever bore the name—so famous since—of a British Parliament.”

We have said that the cause of our Catholic forefathers has been vindicated with praiseworthy skilfulness by Continental pens. The latest of those works of such interest to these islands, appeared in Paris last year, under the title which we have prefixed to the present article. At a time when the political principles of Ireland form the subject of jealous scrutiny from those who are too prone to regard through an exaggerating medium every trait in the character of her well-cherished creed, until they shall fix on some one which may be wrung into a plausible objection to the course of justice, and the secured and peaceful enjoyment of her newly-recognized rights, we cannot too earnestly invite our brethren at home and abroad, to the imitation of the example set them by M. Ozanam. We have too long “trembling inhabited” our own circle, and acted a defensive part; we have repelled, doubtless, one after another, the desultory attacks which the enemies of our freedom have levelled against us, in the individual persons of our saints and heroes: but we have remained there, and have permitted the foe, by an unmolested retreat, to effect new annoyances and incursions upon our frontier. It is not enough to negative, however triumphantly, the reproaches made against our loyalty to the commonwealth, or our capacity for civic duties; we ought to do more than this;—we ought to show—for we *can*

* Histoire de St. Elizabeth (Edit. de Louvain), p. xxvi.

show it,—that in times when the people's voice was hushed in the slumber of feudality, and when the now matured restraints upon the crown's prerogative and the barons' turbulence were as yet only in the germ of childhood,—when humanity of herself could no longer oppose anything to the wildness of material force, threatening to overwhelm the whole of Christendom, as it had already swept away the mighty Empire, with its arts, its arms, and its laws;—that in those momentous times, the task of order, progress, and civilization, too great for the feebleness of humanity, was accepted most generously, and as gloriously achieved, by the only power competent to its performance, and that that power was the *Church*! A series of parallels between the sixteenth and part of the seventeenth centuries, on the one hand, the palmy days of that policy, which exalted state-craft to the heights of veneration, and made religion a dead letter, and adherence to its maxims a badge of disloyalty; and, on the other hand, the great days when the Church stood between the victor and the vanquished, and shielded with her mantle, by turns, the misgoverned people, and the oppressed prince; and consecrated the truce with holy sacrifices, or ratified the just chastisement of offenders by the terms of the anathema:—this is the plan which we recommend to the attention and adoption of the lettered Catholic, who would be a witness to the final and honourable, though somewhat tardy, vindication of the middle ages from the aspersions of his own calumniators. We would not be misunderstood. The temporal power which the Church possessed at that epoch, and wielded for the good of Christendom, while it was admirably fitted for the iron age of power, and the helpless infancy of the English constitution, died with those times, and cannot now be revived amongst us, without a very signal mischief to the whole frame of our political and social organization. The exigencies which gave it birth are no more, and as its own mission has been long ago most gloriously discharged, we have no wish to witness its revival. To render justice to the past is our only aim, and we are sure that M. Ozanam, the able author of the book before us, had no other motive for his labours. We gave in a former number a short account of *Les Deux Chanceliers*. The parallel between the “ages of faith” and the era of modern innovation, is here traced out through an exact and judicious contrast between Bacon, the first of the sages of earth, and St. Thomas à Becket. Appreciating, as much as his warmest admirer could have wished, the philosophical excellence of Bacon, the author exposes how irreconcilable is the life of the *man* with the maxims of the *philosopher*; and thence takes occasion to show, that the broken harmony of the soul demands something

more to re-establish the concert of the will with the understanding, than the wisdom of the loftiest intelligences that ever have walked on earth.

"Their doctrines have brought back the understanding into the better ways, they have formed it to high and vast speculations; they have enlarged, strengthened, it, with all the logical power which is within them; but within them, there is not a power of love, and that is the only one which the will can obey. Hence the will escapes them; she abides in the abysses of corruption, whither she had sunk: she abides there, given up to those sorceresses who intoxicate her with disgraceful enjoyments and painful pleasures, and who are so well called passions. Thus that fatal divorce which is beheld within all souls reappears, more notorious, more melancholy, than ever, within the soul of the philosopher: there are in him two lives, that of the head, and that of the heart; it is the statue of gold with the feet of clay; it is a divided man, that is to say, a helpless one."—p. 250.

But on the other hand

"Christianity has had pity on our nature: it has taken two rays from heaven, of which one is called faith, the other charity, and these two are but of one and the same flame; but the one is the light, the other the warmth. By faith, Christianity possesses itself of the understanding, and draws it from its darkness; by charity, it regenerates the will, and raises it up from its turpitudes. That which it makes credible to the first, it causes the second to love: it makes both to meet upon their path, to tend together toward one same end, which is God. Thus it re-establishes the primitive harmony of the soul; and that the harmony may no more be troubled, that faith may stagger not, that charity may never fail, a society is ordained, believing, loving, harmonious; and that society is the Church. This is the origin of that immovable firmness of thought, of that immense expansion of love, which makes the saints. The saint is a man cast of bronze, but of animated bronze; he is *one* man, that is to say, a mighty man."—p. 251.

The above passages, transferred to our pages from the conclusion of this most interesting volume, contain a sufficiently complete portraiture of the author's plan. Never have we seen a happier choice of examples. We see the youthful son of Nicholas Bacon, the Keeper of the Seals, after lispings flattery in the years of early childhood, and imbibing with wondrous precocity an instinct of public business,—attain, at the young age of nineteen, to his first employment, that of secret agent between Elizabeth and her ambassador in Paris. Then, "disdaining the confined and dusty career of the bar," he concentrates his whole attention on diplomacy, and composes works, which Machiavel might have coveted, upon the demeanour which a shrewd and emulous courtier should make it his pride to observe. But these were not assuredly intended for the vulgar,

nor for those whose good-will it was his interest to win; discarding magnanimity, therefore, which, in his own words, was "but a poetical virtue," he penned for the latter eulogy upon eulogy, with a flattery almost fulsome enough to have sated the vanity of Elizabeth herself. To her praise the English language seemed inadequate; Virgil was courted to assist the panegyrist; and a whole hemistich was culled from the *Æneid* for every single perfection which his creative eye discovered in the person of his idol. Yet he failed in his main object; the perquisites of office were denied him during her reign, although his pride was gratified with the empty title of Counsellor Extraordinary to Her Majesty. The public scorn and execration which avenged upon him the fall of the noble and popular Devereux, Earl of Essex, his patron and benefactor, whom he forsook in the adverse tide of fortune, and whose death he publicly leagued with Coke in compassing, that he might build upon the ruins of that house his own sure way to greatness, seem to have deterred the crafty queen from conferring trust and honour upon one, whose great usefulness in her service would be very considerably impaired by his want of character among the multitude. Nevertheless, he continued to observe mankind, and wrote more books of political morality of the same edifying cast as before, till at last he was enabled to afford in his own person a satisfactory test of the goodness of their doctrine. James I, whom he proclaimed by turns a Trismegistus and a Solomon, was not insensible to his claims; and under this prince we behold him, after rising from a host of other dignities to the successive posts of Attorney and Solicitor-General, at length filling up the measure of his ambition by the exchange of the Keepership of the Seals for the Lord Chancellorship of England, with the titles of Baron Verulam and Viscount St. Alban's, "and seating himself—impure courtier—in the chair of Thomas Morus." Two years, however, reduced him from the apogee of his ambition to the depths of infamy. The man, who, making of immorality a science, had formed its rules into a complete system of practice, and had used it as the sole instrument of his purposes, thought it not unseemly in the highest judge of the realm to adhere to the same course. The court of James certainly afforded him the countenance of much example. The Commons were not so compliant. Not yet at liberty to strike at higher game, they seem to have bestirred themselves with zeal in the repression of individual abuses and malversations of office. The Chancellor was impeached before his peers for having accepted bribes from suitors in his court, and "the Commission charged to draw up his process, established that on twenty-seven different occasions,

he had received more than £6,000 sterling, furniture, diamonds, gratuitous loans, and even a dozen of buttons, for to that insatiable cupidity, all prey was good." Having pleaded guilty to the charges, with a prayer that their lordships "would be merciful to a broken reed," he received for his sentence, on the 3rd May, 1621:—first, to pay a fine of £40,000; secondly, to be imprisoned in the Tower during the king's good pleasure; thirdly, that he should be for ever incapable to fill any office, place, or employment, of a public character; and lastly, that he should never sit in Parliament, nor dwell within the precincts of the court. This sentence, severe, but not disproportionate to the offence, was remitted afterwards step by step, through the sovereign's indulgence; but he was never restored to office, in spite of the numberless letters which he addressed to James, in that phrase of sycophancy which once had served him so well. In one of these, quoted by M. Ozanam, he compares the unworthy Stuart to the Creator, "who produceth and doth not destroy;" and full of this impiety, he exclaims: "*Si tu deseris nos, perimus!*" But

"The crowned passer-by did, like so many others; he let fall a penny into the beggar's hand, but he turned away his eyes with disdain, and did not invite him to follow to the palace. Bacon died in solitude, in 1626."

Thus ended the life of the philosopher of earth.

"It is that of Plato," observes our author, "crowned with flowers at the table of Dionysius; of Aristotle at Alexander's feet; of Cicero dishonouring his exile by a cowardly despair, or burning before Cæsar the debased perfume of his eloquence; of Seneca dying too late to expiate his familiarity with Nero; of Luther signing in favour of the Landgrave of Hesse the consecration of polygamy; of Voltaire admitted to the suppers of Frederick of Prussia; of the whole eighteenth century, and its unspeakable turpitudes."—p. 248.

But, on the other hand, we are presented with a history of the sainted Archbishop of Canterbury, such as the lover of historic truth will welcome to his library. It is, besides, the most complete account of the martyr which the world has had; and furnishes, among other new matter, some precious and edifying particulars relating to his exile in Lyons, where his memory still lives in the local traditions of the lowly. The principal passages of St. Thomas à Becket's life, which have become the subject of Anglican aspersions, viz.: the suddenness of the change, which was operated in his whole life and conversation, by his elevation to the primacy—the opposition which he at once evinced to Henry's designs, at the price of that monarch's friendship,—and his appeal to the Holy See, and consequent flight into France—

are here presented in their true colours, not as claiming our indulgence, but much rather as claiming the admiration of the whole world for his faithfulness unto exile and martyrdom. At the time when he succeeded to the See of Canterbury, England and her Church were groaning beneath the "haughty descendants of sea-kings before whom every knee was bowed." The strange pretensions to interference in Church matters asserted by the Conqueror, had been extended by William Rufus and Henry I, who "possessed themselves of the revenues of vacant benefices; prolonged the widowhood of churches, to work it to the profit of the treasury; and attributed to themselves the rights of nomination and investiture." But the English clergy, under, among other great primates, their Lanfranc and St. Anselm, stood firm against the mailed ranks of their invaders; and Henry II had been bound, at his accession, by solemn oaths, to respect the immunities of the Church, recovered by her pastors during the stormy reign of Stephen. But the notorious deceitfulness and irreligion of the new prince—whose maxim it was, "That it is better to repent of one's words, than of one's works"—gave reason for the general dread of an invasion upon the Church, the more dangerous because of his singular ability. The expectation was verified. Upon Theobald's death, the king looked around him for one whose attachment to his person should secure his adherence to his secret designs, and his choice fell upon Becket, the Chancellor of his kingdom, bound to him as much by gratitude for favours conferred, as by the intimacy of mutual friendship. Him he named to the Holy See, as a worthy successor of Archbishop Theobald, and the Pope confirmed the selection. While opinions were divided as to the consequences of this elevation, its object alone "had seen the future unfold before him, more glorious than his detractors believed, more stormy than his friends augured. 'I know,' said he to the king, 'I know very surely that your mind will be turned away from me. For you will raise, and already you have raised, pretensions which I shall never be able to suffer, and my enviers will find means to interpose between you and me, and your old affection will be changed into an enmity which shall not end.' The king did not accept 'the oracle.'"^{*}—p. 130. The storm at last broke out. The refusal of St. Thomas and the bishops to sacrifice to Henry's pleasure their privileges of exemption from the civil tribunals—no slight one in those days, when penalties of life and limb, for even the most trivial offences, were of everyday occurrence in the feudal courts—a privilege, too, which they

^{*} *Quadrilogus*, cap. xi.

had enjoyed for centuries, led to farther issues. The mysterious demand next made of them, that the bishops should promise to observe *the royal customs*, was fairly met, after deliberation, by the answer, that they would so promise, *salvo ordine suo*; an exception, as our author well remarks, which had ever been made in episcopal oaths of fealty, and which was "the victorious exorcism whereby the Church repelled whatever of the servile there might have been in the obedience." But the bishops, terrified at the anger of the king, in an evil hour forced St. Thomas to yield to their importunities; and, in the unhappy council of Clarendon, to promise upon his troth, "that he would observe the customs *in good faith*." The Constitutions of Clarendon, which incorporate the English Church with the feudal system, were signed and sealed by the prelates on the following day, but St. Thomas, during the delay which had been granted him for examination, confounded by the sturdy reproof of his crosier-bearer, Edward Grim, repented of his past weakness, and referred himself to the Pope. Alexander III condemned the Constitutions, and those who had sworn to them; but praised the repentance of à Becket, and encouraged him to perseverance. The exhortation was heard. Leaving the consequences to God, he set at nought the Constitutions, and continued to enforce, with all the energy of his soul, the high prerogatives of his jurisdiction. At the parliament of Northampton, he was cited to answer for his conduct. The cowardice of the greater number of his prelates, and his own immortal constancy in those days of sore trial, are matter of history. Seated in the vestibule of that council chamber, attired in full pontificals, he bore unmoved the insults of the menials, until the parliament had concluded its deliberations, and the Earl of Leicester, at the head of the barons, came to announce his sentence. Then raising himself, he broke silence. "Son Earl, hearken thou thyself. Thou art not ignorant, my son, how dear and faithful to the king I was when I governed the matters of this world. It was, therefore, that it pleased him to raise me to the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury, in spite, God knoweth, of my resistance, for I knew my weakness, and I submitted myself rather for the love of my king than for the love of my God. * * * My son, hearken again: Forasmuch as the soul is more precious than the body, in so much ought I to obey God rather than earthly kings. Neither law, nor reason, permit the sons to judge their father. Wherefore I decline the king's judgment, and thine, and that of the rest, not being able to be judged by any one after God but the Pope. I appeal before you all to his tribunal, and I withdraw me under the protection

of the Apostolic See and of the Church universal.' He retired, calm and majestic, amid the vociferations of the courtiers, and no one dared to stay him." (p. 148.)

In the Council of Tours, before Alexander III, himself an exile for conscience' sake, Saint Thomas pleaded his cause in person against the emissaries of Henry, who sought his deposition. The archbishop was confirmed in his See by the Sovereign Pontiff; and, therefore, from his cell at Pontigny, he condemned canonically the Constitutions of Clarendon, and launched the anathema against all those who adhered to them. The royal vengeance wreaked itself in a novel manner. The friends of the Saint, in number about 400, were spoiled of their property, and bound by oath to visit their exiled patron in the place of his sojourn. "Behold a being who devises for a bishop a torture more cruel than death; and that torture is, to show him the poor whom he cannot succour—to surround him with heart-rending lamentations which he cannot console!"

The rejection of an equivocal accommodation proposed to him by the tyrant, drew on him the displeasure even of his protector, Louis; and he was obliged to quit Pontigny for the "more free" country of the Lyonnais. From Lyons he addressed to the Pope, to his own suffragans, and to King Henry, those undying letters which have survived to our own days. We should but impair them by curtailment, and we have no space for a complete extract.

From Lyons he was recalled to England, by the series of happy coincidences which restored to Rome her pontiff, and left him free to exercise his power. Warned by the fate of Frederick of Germany, Henry trembled in his turn for his continental possessions, even although the servility of his island subjects left him at ease with respect to England. In a meadow at Freitville, appropriately named the "Traitor's Field," Saint Thomas was reconciled to his sovereign, and paid upon his bended knee the heartfelt obeisance of gratitude. Yet "that very morning Henry had sworn before some persons, that he never would give Thomas the kiss of peace. And in fact he did not give it."

St. Thomas returned to England; but the king had never designed to keep the word he had plighted. The dissolute and apostate seemed privileged to heap every insult upon the head of the primate, while the unruly bishops were countenanced openly by Henry. Great abuses and malversations had been introduced into every department of the Church; and St. Thomas applied himself unsparingly to root them out, and restore order to the sanctuary. His murder arrested his progress in this good work.

The venal prelates who refused him submission had carried their complaints to Henry; and the hint implied by the memorable words which followed, was not lost upon his slaves: "Cursed be those whom I nourish with my favour, if they cannot avenge me, and rid my realm of this turbulent priest!" Four knights undertook the deed. "Tradition reports, that the tree under which they met to conspire together, smitten with malediction, became withered up." They crossed to England, and on reaching Canterbury entered the chamber of the Archbishop, and made no secret to him of their intentions. His fortitude did not permit him the cowardice of flight. In the evening, when he went into the church where the monks were chanting their office, he refused to suffer the gates to be closed, saying, "That it was not a fit thing to make a stronghold of God's house." The murderers appeared, and demanded "the traitor Archbishop." At this moment all his clerks fled except three, among whom was Edward Grim, his honest crosier-bearer. One knight, laying his hands on him, ordered him to follow him, as his prisoner; but the saint, plucking his mantle from the soldier's grasp, replied, "What you would do to me you shall do here." They summoned him to absolve the excommunicated bishops; "Until that they have complied with the holy canons, I will not absolve them," was his answer. Placing himself then in a kneeling posture, he proffered his last prayer: "To God, to Blessed Mary, to the holy patrons of this place, and to the blessed martyr Saint Denys, I commend my soul and the cause of the Church." "Upon this, a sword-cut wounded the crosier-bearer's arm, which attempted to shield the Archbishop, and grazed the head of the Archbishop himself; a second blow stretched him on the ground; a third clove in a large portion of the skull. And one of the murderers, inserting his sword, protruded the brain, and scattered it over the pavement." (p. 196.) Their next step was, of course, the pillage of the monastery.

Thus died the martyr, and thus, too, terminates the parallel between the saints of heaven and the Antæi of earth. For as M. Ozanam well expresses it,—

"The history of St. Thomas is that of many among the saints; it is that of many myriads of martyrs before the proconsuls, of Athanasius before Julian, of Ambrose before Theodosius, of Chrysostom before Arcadius, of Gregory VII before Henry IV, of Nepomucene before Wenceslas, of Bishop Fisher and Thomas Morus before Henry VIII; and also (why should I not say it?) of Pius VII before Napoleon. For at that time, we learned by a great example, that, in God's Church, the traditions of a just and religious independence were not destroyed."—p. 249.

We cannot better conclude this portion of our paper, than in the last words of the volume before us. "And now you have before you two great figures. Rationalism has made the one, Catholicism has made the other; it is for you to see to which of the two you will surrender your soul."

The influence of the middle ages upon the very frame-work of society, extended itself into the times which succeeded them. It would astonish the self-seeking generation of scorners, if they but knew to what amount they themselves are indebted to the opinions and institutions at which they love to rail, for much of that modern enlightenment which they are wont to praise; more in disparagement of the "dark ages," than from any seemly estimation of its worth. It required more than the rapine of the Tudors, or the falsehood of the Stuarts, could possibly effect, to destroy the manly and athletic character of the English mind; for the germ was first planted there by the hands of men in whom was the spirit of God, inspiring the soul with freedom; and it had been fostered for ages by kindly watchers, who scrupled not to pour forth their saintly life-blood for its sake when it lacked nourishment; and when its enemies at the last had slain the keepers, and sought to subdue to themselves this fruit of their long watchings, they found its roots closely entwined and strongly embedded in the deep heart of the soil; so that, though it were easy to dishonour it, and shear it for a while of its loveliness, to eradicate it altogether was impossible. For the genuineness of freedom is understood by none but the faithful man; it is in the name of religion alone that he invokes her presence; his respect for the laws knows a better principle than the state-idolatry of the ancient empire, or the monstrous legalism of modern jurists. His fortitude is not insolent, nor his independence licentious; he is a citizen, because he is a Christian. The earliest writer upon our English constitution, the illustrious Fortescue, the Chancellor of Henry VI, has recorded the principles, which in his day were entertained upon the mutual duties and rights of the governors and the governed; than which, as Mr. Amos observes, "The sentiments of Algernon Sidney were not more inimical to the power of tyrants, or more repugnant to the abject language of the Oxford Decree, or that which disturbed the last moments of Russell."* The flag of our liberties was blessed by the anointed hands of bishops, and was spread to the breeze before the porch of the sanctuary.

We have no intention to detract one jot from the value of the praise, which is due to the book before us. We regret, however,

* "Fortescue de Laudibus," &c. By A. Amos, Esq., p. 43, n.

that our author's attention has not directed itself to the elucidation of one important point on which he has lightly touched, and which would have proved of most admirable service in this great work of love and justice—we mean the political supremacy over Christendom, which was, by the constitution of that magnificent commonwealth, swayed by the Popes during the whole period of the middle ages. Wherever this subject has been treated by those who know how to inspire themselves with the spirit of its epoch, the best results have never failed to follow. The warmest partisan of Right Divine on the one hand, and the sternest upholder of democracy upon the other, have reason to join in commendation of that marvellous scheme of international jurisprudence, which preserved order from the threatenings of anarchy, by uniting the civil into one common cause with the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and, at the same time, effectually forbade the tyranny of the rulers, by reminding them, as well as their people, that the abuse of that *power which was of God*, to purposes of impiety or injustice, at once determined its duration, and left the subject free to accept the dispensation from his natural allegiance, which, in such cases, was never withheld by the head of the Christian commonwealth. We are not to be scared by names. In our days, we hardly know the Tory who will deny to the subject the right of resistance in the extreme case of a tyrannical executive, but here the subject is reduced to decide for himself the moment at which his allegiance is cancelled and rebellion ceases to be treason, and at his own peril must he so decide. We do not mean to dispute the fitness of this state of things, but, we will ask, what would have been the state of Christendom, in the infancy of constitutions and constitutional ideas, and amid the general dearth of these means of improvement, in their regard, with which we are now readily and liberally furnished, if the decision of these important points of ethics had been entrusted to the indiscriminating multitude, and not rather vested in the Church, their faithful and enlightened guardian, from whom too they were wont to receive instruction in all their duties, and spiritual aids to discharge them. So, on the other hand, while the duty of obedience to the righteous ruler was carefully preached to the people, the presence of a superior in the palace of the prince, to warn him from injustice and irreligion, and to temper the sword of justice with the sweetness of mercy, and to soften the harshness of the latter by interpretation of the spirit, must undoubtedly be regarded by every unbiassed judgment, to have been of incalculable usefulness in every body politic. The mediation of the sovereign Pontiff between belligerent states, was always desirable to humanity in

those days of ruthless warfare, and was often successful in producing the most valuable results. But to stamp the seal of confirmation upon the temporal commission of the Church, it was necessary, beyond every thing, that its authority thus summarily to intermeddle with the affairs of kingdoms, should be recognized by those kingdoms themselves; for, otherwise, its benevolent designs must have been made void for want of the power to carry them into execution. Now, it should be remembered that the feudal system, as has been most ably shewn by Dr. Wiseman, in the *Annali delle Scienze Religiose*, vol. i. *Mem. 2, Settembre et Ottobre*, 1835, may be regarded under two points of view, "As the form of government of each nation in particular, or a strong and mighty bond, which, uniting together these different states, formed of them one single body—the state of Christendom." Under the first, "The same relations of right and duty which united the vassals to the lords, united the lords to the king; and moreover, in case of oppression or injustice, they might appeal to a higher judge." This judge was the Pope. The instances of appeals to the See of St. Peter in feudal questions, are very frequent in the annals of the times. But, it is under the second aspect of feudalism that the Papal supremacy appears more clearly recognized by the constitutions of the various Christian states. The prevailing notion of the times was, that "The Church and the state were, in substance, one sole and same thing; one great Christian state, although exteriorly they seemed to form two different societies." This doctrine is to be found in the express texts of the constitutions of the different kingdoms, together with the no less important doctrine that, "That double power, the spiritual and temporal, are both confided to the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, and visible head of the Church." From the supposed union of these two powers, it followed, as Eichorn, and after him, Dr. Wiseman, have observed, that the question so long agitated between the Church and the empire, was not the system itself, but the pre-eminence in that system; "that is to say, whether of the two should be subordinate in the feudal system to the other—the Pope or the emperor." But we recommend the whole of this very interesting paper of Dr. Wiseman, with the numerous authorities which he cites, to the attention of our readers.

Thus, the famous bugbear, with which the second childhood of our England has so long scared itself—the deposing power—was in fact, a wise political regulation, and nothing more. It is true, that the pens of its vindicators have treated it for the most part, as of divine institution, but this difficulty vanishes when we remind the reader, that the wisdom of our forefathers based

society altogether upon the divine appointment, imparting power to the human race, to be used by them, under such forms of polity, as they themselves might choose. The "social compact," raved of by Rousseau, and countenanced by Blackstone, who ought to have known better, would have been a fertile laughing-stock to our fathers, who believed, as we believe, that the savage state is *not* the state of nature. Hence the temporal headship of the Roman Pontiff, while it continued to form the cornerstone of the Christian commonwealth, was justly believed to be "of God."

That power was something more than nominal. While it lasted, the guarantees of freedom which the subject might chance to possess, were rarely violated, and even then, still more rarely was the wrong unredressed. Where there appeared to be no intermediate power between the throne and the subject, there the influence of the Church became of a more positive and direct agency. It has been well asked by Montesquieu, who on this point will be an unsuspected authority—

"Where would Spain and Portugal have been, since the loss of their laws, but for this power, which singly checks arbitrary government? Barrier ever good,—when there is none beside it: for as despotism is the cause of frightful ills to human nature, the very evil which limits it is a blessing. . . . The English, in favour of liberty, have removed all the intermediate powers which formed their monarchy. They have good reason to preserve that liberty; if they chanced to lose it, they would become one of the most slavish peoples of the earth."—*Esprit des Lois*, Liv. ii. chap. iv.

The Reformation, which extinguished the relations of several states with the rest of Christendom, and introduced distrust and divisions into the whole community, the decline of feudalism, and other minor causes, determined the existence of this admirable Commonwealth. It had performed its mission, however, and it were the height of folly to desire its restoration. But the effect of the abolition was speedily felt in those countries, which, by reason of their original adoption of the civil code, or of their more complete subjection to the worst passages in the feudal law, were behind our own country and some few others, in the career of progress. Henceforward, their chains were riveted, apparently for ever. But in England, which had so long enjoyed the proud privilege of a parliament, of the chartered peace of municipalities, and the subjects' dearest birth-right, of trial by jury, the consequences were most remarkable. The coerced people were not long in discovering that their chief security had hitherto been the restraint from without the realm, which had hitherto kept the sovereign from any open violation

of their liberties,—and that not the parliaments, nor the corporations,—nor even trial by jury,—had had so great a share in their well-being as they had at first conceived. For not only were the recognized laws of the realm notoriously violated by the Tudor, who gave to his proclamations the force of acts of parliament, but also the parliament itself, so far from restraining him in his career, became the best and most willing instrument of his desires. Even the favourable verdicts of venal or affrighted juries did not suffice to the rapid persecutions of the crown, and the ingenuity of judges was resorted to, for the purpose of turning the high court of parliament itself into another Star-Chamber. Lord Coke tells the story in the true language of loyalism:—

“I had it of Sir Thomas Gawdye, Knight, a grave and reverend judge of the King's Bench, who lived at that time, that King Henry the Eighth commanded him to attend the chiefe justices, and to know whether a man that was forthcoming might be attainted of high treason by parliament, and never called to his answer. The judges answered, that it was a dangerous question, and that the high court of parliament ought to give examples to inferiour courts for proceeding according to justice, and no inferiour court could do the like; and they thought that the high court of parliament would never do it. But being by the expresse commandement of the King, and pressed by the said Earle to give a direct answer, they said, that if he be attainted by parliament, it could not come in question afterwards, whether he were called or not called to answer. And albeit their opinion was according to law, yet might they have made a better answer; for, by the statutes of Mag. Cart. ca. 29. 5. E. 3. cap. 9. and 28. E. 3. cap. 5, no man ought to be condemned without answer, &c. which they might have certified, but, *facta tenent multa, que fieri prohibentur*, the act of attainder being passed by Parliament, did bind, as they resolved. The party against whom this was intended, was never called in question, but the first man after the said resolution, that was so attainted, and never called to answer, was the said Earl of Essex.”—4 *Instit.* 37.

The divine right of rulers, which, rightly understood, had been, in happier times, the strongest security against the invasion of private rights, now was handled by the pulpit-partisans of the Stuart dynasty into an argument of non-resistance. So extensive had the prerogative become, that during those ages of the Reformation, the sin of Popery was enacted against in parliament, and punished in the courts, not as heresy against God, but as high treason to the sovereign! So complete had been the revolution in thought, word, and deed, among the reigning authorities! The courtier-leaders of the new faith, found it their interest to keep pace with the retrograde movement,—and hence the spaniel-like meanness of Bacon himself,

who was by no means singular in the intenseness of his worship, for he was the contemporary of Coke, among the rest, of whom even James the First had declared, "that he was the fittest instrument for a tyrant that had ever been known in England." Not only in speech, but much more in action, Euphuism was at court the established order of the day. But the people were not so easily reconciled to the change. The sudden cessation of the ancient check to arbitrary power, had plunged England into a deeper gulph of despotism than she had ever known before. It was for the people to create another in its place, out of the means which were still in their own hands. The imbecility of James favoured the commencement of the enterprise, and under the reign of his son, the English liberties were at last consolidated,—but the reaction was fearful,—and the price paid for the boon was the extinction of the monarchy—and the Iron Mask at Whitehall!

If St. Thomas of Canterbury had defended the rights of the English Church against the populace, and not against the crown, he would have won and retained the sympathies and love of even the Anglican clergy of modern times. As it was, however, one of the first acts of the Reformation was to cite the saint, in impious mockery of forms of justice, to appear in thirty days before the council, and there to answer to a charge of high treason. On the 2d of June 1538,* by a decree of the king in council, St. Thomas was declared "guilty of the crime of leze-majesté, treason, perjury, and rebellion." The hatred which his firmness against the regal prerogative excited in the breast of every man who preached the freedom of conscience, as understood by the makers of the Reformation, affords several other instances equally characteristic. We have at this moment open before us the famous Parisian edition of the *Horæ Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ*, published in the year 1526, with the rubric in English. On the fly-leaf of our copy, is the autograph of White Kennett, the famous Protestant bishop of Peterborough, who seems to have cherished in secret a formula of prayer which the homilies pronounced idolatrous, and the possession of which had been made illegal by act of parliament. But the castigating hand of the bishop had been busy on the book, and the passages which he has obliterated belong to one of three classes,—1st, all sentences in which indulgences are named; 2d, all words expressing the title of Pope; or 3dly, all passages which relate to

* Both the citation and the decree are to be met with in Wilkins' *Concilia*, vol. iii. p. 836.

the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury.* In the last class, the episcopal virulence is perhaps more alive than in either of the former. It would be worth the while to ascertain whether that orthodox prelate considered, that in performing this duty of correction, he had succeeded in removing *every* taint of heterodoxy from the book.

But whatever the opinion of Protestant prelates upon this subject is, or may have been, it is cheering to know, that even in these days, the bright examples of the Church of our fathers are not lost upon the lover of British freedom, any more than upon the practices of Christian duties. If we cling to the ancient faith of England with undying adherence, upon the one hand, we preserve the love of justice and hatred of oppression, which were warm within our fathers' hearts, upon the other.

"And if," as Mr. Ozanam eloquently expresses it, "in this famous isle, whole generations have kept themselves immovable in the faith of their ancestors: if, after three hundred years of persecutions and reproaches, Catholicism has raised her brow, and now extends herself with a marvellous force, that makes Reformation to tremble even in her golden palaces; if Ireland has broken her bands by one sublime effort,—if a wondrous man has arisen from the midst of his Catholic brethren, and has, in their name, protested against the satraps of heresy; it is, perhaps, because, among those faithful generations, in that Ireland, and upon that man, hovers the great soul of St. Thomas of Canterbury. God forbid that I compare a mortal man, and one that is not yet judged, with him whose memory has received a solemn consecration! But him also, the unconquerable Archbishop, his enemies called the Great Agitator!"

And to these heroes of the middle age, those who walk not with us, have reason to be grateful too. For if our England had succumbed to Henry II, in the person of her Church, four centuries before the light of knowledge appeared in the brightness of noon-day,—if the temporal power, so material and barbarous, had at that time absorbed the spiritual power, as has long been the case in the Russian empire,—the whole kingdom, shut out from all intercourse with the faithful nations around them, "save on the field of battle," must assuredly "have descended to a degree of brutishness comparable to the state of Russia, from the day when she became schismatic down to the

* There is in the library of St. Edmund's College, in Hertfordshire, a Missal, in which the Mass for St. Thomas of Canterbury has been erased. The word Pope has also been made to disappear throughout the whole volume. This missal was, it would seem, intended to be, like the "*Philologia Sacra*" of Glassius, "*nostris temporibus accommodata*."

days of Peter the Great." If, too, the destruction of feudalism, and the formation of modern society upon its ruins, be justly regarded as two great benefits to the European race, then all Europe must applaud the generous devotion of the Church, which inspired her to stand forth, resist, and overcome, as often as the feebleness of the sovereign, the lowliness of the commons, and the sense of its own iron strength, tempted feudality forth from its just bounds, and invited it to undertake its frequent invasions upon the entirety of society. An union with the Church, its only potent adversary, must have crushed all opposition, doubled the intensity of its power, and prolonged for many ages the era of its reign. Perhaps it is not too much to suppose, that even in our days we might still have had to look forward to the closing scene of its existence.

We now take our leave of the book before us, with our thanks to its author for his services to our national cause, and the sanguine assurance, that it will soon become the welcome guest of many an English circle.

ART. III.—1. *Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. History of the Forerunners of the Reformation.* By Dr. Ludwig Flathe. Leipsig. 1835.

2. *Histoire des Vaudois des Vallées du Piémont.* Par A. Muston. Paris. 1834.

3. *Considérations sur les Vaudois.* Par M. Peyran.

4. *Recherches Historiques sur la véritable Origine des Vaudois, et sur le Caractère de leurs Doctrines Primitives.* Paris. 1836.

AMONG the credentials of a new sect, it is important that a good pedigree should find its place. With a true religion there is no difficulty in satisfying this necessity, or, rather, the religion is a genealogy unto itself. But if, unhappily, the falsehood of the doctrine should render it desirable to resort to some "ingenious device" of the coiner's art, and to gild the naked dross in the glitter of a fiction, there is, at the outset, to be overcome the jealous vigilance of all contemporary observers, and then for an eternal future, to be feared the hazard of detection and exposure. Now these are all very serious things, and not so easily to be guarded against, as easily to be foreseen. The consequence, however, is one very fatal to the sanguinely-conceived and cunningly-devised forthcomings of the ambitious brains of our religionist,—they want the sanction of age,—

they tell too plainly of notions and motions, human, every-day, common-place,—not a man who reviews them but can put his finger upon every article of them, and say, “This came or might have come in my own generation.”

Our Anglican fellow-countrymen seem, at last, to fear that they are thus awkwardly situated. We have drawn attention more than once, and especially in our last number, to the evidence which has of late years been repeatedly afforded us by the High Church section of their body, of an irresistible conviction upon their parts, that notwithstanding the great rejoicings which welcomed the dawning of the morn of the English Tercentenary,—a period, after all, of only three centuries,—is not in fact such an existence as gives to that or any Church professing to be Christian, a very great subject of exultation, and that in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, that Church must, at the best, be deemed but ill-provided with a title to her followers’ allegiance, which contents herself with tracing out a descent more or less unbroken from some sectary of the sixteenth century. We took occasion, however, to demonstrate how utterly groundless and inconsequential were the pretensions put forth by these discontented upholders of free inquiry to any more illustrious descent, or to any portion of the traditions of the primitive Church, or of their divine jurisdiction and apostolical succession. The attempt, however, to make these pretensions good, had been already of frequent occurrence, but of an uniform ill-success. It has been one of the means employed at various periods in the history of Anglicanism, by such of her sons as believed it important to establish a communion with the Church of the apostolic age.

It was only one of those means; and it is our intention in the present paper to indicate another method which is sometimes employed for the same end, but of a character altogether different. We allude to the endeavours of certain writers to affiliate the Protestants to the Waldenses, and these again to SS. Paul and James, thus tracing the stream of the Reformation to within the sacred enclosure of the apostolic college itself. An easy, clear, and natural conclusion,—only supposing the premises to have been sufficiently founded upon fact! This important condition, however, has as yet been complied with, neither on the part of the Waldenses themselves, nor on that of their would-be descendants,—and we trust that we shall make good this assertion in the present article, so as to satisfy the judgment of every sensible and candid reader.

Who were the Vaudois or Waldenses? What was their era? What were their doctrines? And in what relation do they

stand to the Vaudois of the present day? These are the questions which naturally present themselves to the mind, on the answers to which rests the whole controversy before us. And they must be resolved by an appeal to facts and documents, without whose testimony on the points all history becomes romance, all conclusions, speculation. It may here be proper at once to observe, that the Vaudois writers, as well modern as ancient (we speak of course relatively), although much divided against each other, and even contradicting themselves, as we shall hereafter show, with respect to the real antiquity of their Alpine sect, are nevertheless agreed in giving the most unqualified contradiction to the testimony which Catholic and other writers of credibility have at all times rendered to their descent from an obscure fanatic of the latter end of the twelfth century, Peter Valdo, the merchant of Lyons. They renounce him for their founder,—for, being Alpines, how can they brook aught but an Alpine extraction? and claiming him for their descendant, they disclaim him for the author of their name, affecting, in their passion for antiquity, to discover in their own valleys, under their Latin or French designations, an etymology everlasting as the hills which tower around them. The question, therefore, having assumed the character of so tangible an issue, we proceed, at once, to the investigation, not being desirous on the one hand that Valdo should be thus ungratefully deprived of his rights of paternity, nor on the other hand, that the preceding annals of the Church should be intruded on by a heresy, which, in fact, never belonged to them. We are greatly indebted to the intelligent and learned author of the *Recherches Historiques*, a Piedmontese bishop, for the long and numerous citations upon this and many other heads which he has given us in his valuable work, the fruit of severe and laborious research, and of which we intend to avail ourselves largely upon the present occasion.

We shall begin with the Catholic view of the subject; and this, not only because we of all others have the right to do so, but because that view is, as usual, the oldest in the field, and here, as everywhere else, we find our adversaries reduced to *deny* our statements and *protest* against our proofs. But the evidence which they would repudiate is that of all the contemporary writers of their founder, Valdo, who are of one consent in establishing his fame as a new heresiarch, following practices, and preaching doctrines wholly distinct indeed from those of the Church, but equally independent in their origin of all the heretical or schismatic sects that had appeared since the days of the apostles down to their own times. To understand more

perfectly the details of this new division in Christendom, it is necessary to take a short review of the state of ecclesiastical affairs during the twelfth century, the period of its occurrence. The phenomena, which the annals of that age present to our contemplation, are of the most startling kind. It was of all others the age of new opinions in matters of faith and morals, bearing relation each to the other in no single respect, save in the monstrous extravagance of their conception, and in their fearful consequences, memorials of one common extraction. According to Michelet, the Rationalist historian of France, (vol. III. c. vi.) "it was as in the secular days of the great week of creation. Nature, assaying herself, cast forth at first strange, gigantic, ephemeral productions,—monstrous abortions,—whose remains inspire with horror." The unaccountable exuberance which then displayed itself in the moral and religious world, would well justify the assertion that "the errors to be found there are of such a number and such a nature, that the preachers of the time only left to the innovators and reformers who were to come the embarrassment of selection."* Unhappily, too, the evil did not end there. The exterior world was doomed to receive its visitations also at the hands of the heretics whenever the latter thought fit to draw the proper conclusion from the maxims they had learned. In the name of the Bible (for with the reservation of Abeillard, not one of these restless spirits built up his system on the base of Rationalism), the churches were pillaged and profaned, the crosses burned, ecclesiastical property invaded, and the clergy insulted, on every side. The new glosses thrown by these sectarian teachers on the ethics of Scripture, tended to fill Europe with those hordes of Condottieri and other brigands, who were without faith as without a country, and brought, in a word, such general woes upon Christendom, that even M. Michelet confesses that there was left no other pledge of order than *Christianity*, and that *the safety of Christianity was certainly in the unity of the Church*.† The mission, however, of these ebullitions was hitherto one of destruction only. The human mind was yet too young in the service of heresy to converge itself and its opportunities upon any great plan for the ages which lay before it. It was reserved for the sixteenth century at once to destroy the past, and upon the ruins of its grandeur to raise up its own scheme of mischief for the times to come.

On the other hand, the Church, profoundly impressed with the gravity of the evil, opposed to it all the means of which she found herself in possession, and even called forth new resources

* Recherches Hist. p. 386.

† Michelet, Hist. de France, t. iii. c. vii.

of a character peculiarly adapted to the age. We have treated of its splendid prerogatives in another paper; suffice it here to observe, that before the end of the century, the reaction had become complete.

In some instances, indeed, the zeal of the religiously disposed outran discretion. This was to so unhappy a degree the case of Peter Valdo, that in spite of the innocence, or rather the praiseworthiness, of his first steps in the reform of manners and renovation of Christian spirit, he soon fell away into disobedience and schism, and finally into the heresy which survived himself. Upon this point, all his contemporaries are quite agreed, and they fix the commencement of his heresy at the year 1180 or thereabouts. These contemporaries are Bernard, Abbot of Foncald, who lived at the end of the twelfth century; Alan de l'Isle, the Universal Doctor, who died at the commencement of the thirteenth century; Eberard de Bethune, and Peter de Vaucernay, also writers of the same period; Stephen de Belleville, a Dominican and Inquisitor at that time; Moneta, a Dominican, at the beginning of the thirteenth century; Conrad, Abbot of Ursperg, whose book against the Vaudois bears the date of 1212; Rainier Sacco, the contemporary and colleague of Moneta, who having been seventeen years a priest and bishop of the Cathari, allies of the Vaudois, afterwards renounced his errors, and during the rest of his days presided in Lombardy as an inquisitor over the followers of these two heresies; Peter of Polichdorf, a writer of the middle of the same century,—an anonymous writer (supposed to be Ivonet), whose treatise is preserved in the fifth volume of D. Marten's *Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum*, p. 1778, and is believed to have been as ancient as the end of the thirteenth century,—and other writers, the contemporaries of all these, and agreeing in the same recital. As it would be useless to our purpose, and fatiguing to the reader, to quote each and all of this overwhelming array of testimonies, we shall content ourselves with that of Stephen de Belleville, as being more detailed and explanatory than some of the others, on the circumstances which gave rise to the sect; and the rather so because the curious reader may find, if he pleases, all the other authorities, as well as this one, collected in the original language of the writers, among the *Pièces Justificatives* at the end of the *Recherches Historiques*.

"Now the Waldenses were so styled from the first author of this heresy, who was named Waldensis.* They are also styled Poor Men

* A word of the same etymology as Valdo; and either manner of being spelt, supposed to have been a local name derived from the city of Valdès in Flanders, or, more probably, from the village of Vaud, near Lyons.

of Lyons, for there they began the profession of poverty. But they call themselves Poor of Spirit, because of what the Lord saith, Matt. v., 'Blessed are the poor in spirit;' and truly poor in spirit are they, for they want the spiritual gifts of the Holy Spirit.

"Now that sect began in this manner, according to what I have heard from many who have seen their first members, and from a priest who was much honoured, and a rich man in the city of Lyons, and a friend of our brethren, who was called Bernard Ydros; who, when he was a young man and a copyist, copied for the same Waldenses, for money, the first books they ever had in the Roman language (that is, the French), a certain grammarian translating and dictating to him, named Stephen de Ansa (in the Cod. Rothomag. de Emsá), whom I have often seen, who, being afterwards preferred to a benefice in the greater church at Lyons, being promoted to the priesthood, falling from the battlements of a house which he was building, ended his days by a sudden death.

"A certain rich man, in the said city, named Waldensis, hearing the Gospels, since he was not very learned, being curious to understand what they said, made an agreement with the said priests; with the one that he should translate them to him in the vulgar tongue; with the other, that he should write down what the first should dictate; which they did: likewise many books of the Bible, and maxims of saints arranged according to heads, which they called Opinions; which when the said citizen often read and got by heart, he proposed to follow evangelical perfection as the Apostles had done. Who, having sold all his goods, in contempt of the world, cast away the money produced by them to the poor, and usurped and presumed upon the office of the Apostles, by preaching the gospels, and those things which he committed to memory, in the ways and streets, and by gathering unto him many men and women to do the same, committing unto them the Gospels. These also, of every base degree, he sent through the neighbouring towns, and penetrating into houses and preaching in the streets, and even in churches, incited others to do the same. But when out of their rashness and ignorance they had every where spread abroad many errors and scandals, being summoned before the Archbishop of Lyons, who was called John, he forbade them to intrude into the expounding or preaching of scripture. But they referring to the reply of the Apostles, in Acts, chap. v., their master usurping Peter's office, even as he answered the chief priests, said, 'It is right to obey God more than men,' who commanded the Apostles, 'Preach the Gospel to every creature,'—at the end of Mark. As though the Lord should have said to them the things he spake to the Apostles, who yet presumed not to preach until they became endued with might from on high, and received the gift of all tongues. They therefore, Waldensis to wit and his people, first out of presumption and usurpation of the apostolic office, fell into disobedience, then into contumacy, then into the sentence of excommunication. Afterwards, driven out of that land, being summoned to the council which was before that of Lateran, (the fourth it seems*) and

* The remark of Echard, the editor.

being pertinacious, they were finally adjudged schismatics. Then in the land of Provence and Lombardy mingling with other heretics and imbibing and adopting their errors, they were adjudged heretics, most hateful and most perilous to the Church, rambling every where, displaying the seeming of holiness and faith, but holding not its truth, so much the more dangerous as they were the more concealed and disguised with all sorts of dresses and artifices. Once a certain leader amongst them was taken, who carried about him the tokens of many contrivances, whereby he transfigured himself like a Proteus. If he were sought for in one character, and it were known to him, he changed instantly into another. Sometimes he wore the dress and symbols of a pilgrim, sometimes the staff and irons of a penitent, sometimes he feigned himself a cobbler, sometimes a barber, sometimes a reaper, &c. Likewise so do the others. Now this sect began about the year 1170, (in the Cod. Rothom. 1180,) under John, surnamed Bolesmanis, Archbishop of Lyons.*

William of Puylaureus, the historian of the war against the Albigenses, one of the sects of this period, and himself a contemporary of Valdo, enables us to ascertain with sufficient precision, who were the heretics of Lombardy and Provence, to whom the disciples of the Lyons merchant united themselves, according to the preceding citation, after their precipitate departure from the place of their nativity. Speaking of the fearful ravages which these miscreants, whom it suits the morality of the Anglican Church, high and low, to vindicate and applaud, committed in the fairest and richest quarters of Europe, he tells us that in these hordes of bandits, "There were some who were Arians, others Manicheans,† others again *Valdenses* or *Lyonnese*, who although among themselves disagreeing, did nevertheless all conspire, for the loss of souls, against the Catholic faith; and yet those Valdenses did dispute most sharply against the others. Whence, even in hatred to them, the others were received into communion by ignorant priests. Wherefore the earth, as though reprobate and well nigh accursed, brought little forth but thistles and thorns, robbers and plunderers, thieves, man-slayers, adulterers and open usurers."‡ But we shall return to the question of their connexion with other heretics, when we come to the consideration of their doctrines. The name Vaudois or Waldenses, was not the only one borne by the sect: we have already mentioned that of Poor Men of Lyons. They were known also by the names of Leonists, from the city of their origin, and Sabbatati or Insabbatati, from their superstitious practice of wearing

* Recherches Histor. p. 455.

† These were the Albigenses proper.

‡ See this passage in the "Pièces Justificatives," Rech. Hist. p. 473.

a singular kind of sandal, which they imagined to have been apostolic.* These names are employed without discrimination by all the writers who make any mention of Valdo or his disciples, but in other respects there is a uniformity of statement and even of language in all the numerous narrations of the sect which have descended to us, such as is rarely met with except as a tolerably sure indication of veracity. In a word, the contemporaries of the early disciples of Valdo are agreed in treating them as a new sect, deriving their name of Vaudois from their founder, and seeking countenance and alliance among the other sectaries of the period. Not a single Vaudois writer on the other hand has come down to us from that age to prove the so much desired antiquity of his descent, but actually we have in its place an express defiance from the exact Moneta, which at that day was wholly unanswered, and although in our times accepted by the more adventurous sons of the ancient Vaudois, has resulted only in the defeat and disgrace of their ridiculous pretensions. "If the Vaudois say," thus he writes,† "that they are anterior to Valdo, let them prove it by some evidence; which they are in utter impossibility of doing."

Nor is this all. There is, happily for the cause of truth, still extant, in the *Liber Statutorum Civitatis Pinarolii*, the first historic document which notices the appearance, then quite recent, of the Vaudois in their village of the Alps. It will be seen that the citizens of Pignerol, certainly the most competent to say who were and who were not their countrymen, did notwithstanding regard these same Vaudois as foreigners who had newly come into Piedmont. "Also it is enacted, that if any man or woman shall give hospitality to any Vaudois man or woman, knowingly, in the territory of Pignerol, he or she shall pay a fine of ten soldi, as often as such hospitality is given."‡ The date of this bye-law is 1220, a date sufficiently near to the epoch of Valdo's defection, to explain the reason why, for the first time, any mention of the Vaudois should have then been made on a historical record, while, at the same time, it becomes apparent that that term was not understood in any local or territorial signification, and that it represented a class of persons forming a ludicrously small minority among the people, and evidently strangers in the land which imposed such heavy penalties on their entertainment.§ The Vaudois themselves have not always been averse to recognise so plain a truth. In

* Eberard de Bethune's *Liber Anti-Hæresis*, cap. xxv. ap.; Bibl. PP. t. xxiv. p. 1572; Rech. Hist. p. 146.

† Rech. Hist. p. 52.

‡ Ibid. p. 490.

§ Ten soldi were equivalent to nearly 300 livres of the present day.

1585, they presented a petition to Charles Emmanuel the First, in which they content themselves with claiming an antiquity for their religion "*of some hundreds of years*" only.* In 1599, they addressed a letter to Lesdiguières, praying his good offices with Emmanuel Philibert, and setting forth that "it is not since fifty years alone that the Vaudois people has had the knowledge of the pure truth, but even from *five to six hundred years*, of which his Excellency cannot be ignorant."† In 1573, they had already presented a petition to the Comte de Birague, Lieutenant of the King of France, on their side of the Alps, couched in these terms: "The Vaudois intreat his Excellency to make it known to the King that it is more than four hundred and fifty years that their people, from father to son, even down to themselves, have made profession of this religion," &c.‡ We shall simply add to the store of evidences and proofs which sparkle in every page of the book before us, that in the hilly country which surrounds Lyons, the country of Peter Valdo, we ourselves have heard the Protestants of those parts spoken of by their fellow-countrymen, under the name of Vaudois. A striking confirmation this of the etymology advanced by Catholic writers.

But if these writers be credible and their story a true one, what becomes of Vaudois antiquity, the most interesting monument of the history of Christianity?§ What becomes of M. Muston's eloquence and extasy on the subject of "this little people, forgotten, poor, weak according to the world, but full of a faith powerful and victorious, which has traversed ages, revolutions of empires, and all the wrecks of the earth || this people apart and so remarkable, which holds historically to the cradle of Christendom, &c. &c. &c.?"¶ Are these magnificent titles and privileges to be abandoned by those Esaus, their possessors, without even the poor price of Edom's pottage in exchange? The three first books which head our article forbid the base suspicion, and call upon us to investigate the other side of the controversy. And here, doubtless, we are going to be favoured with every sort of document from the historical to the romantic, from the polemical to the philosophical, from prose to poetry, culled here and there from the richness of those pages in their annals, "which," as M. Muston, their historian, avers, "no poem can equal; than which never

* Rech. Hist. p. 267.

† Ibid. p. 268.

‡ Ibid. p. 269.

§ Brez's Hist. des Vaud. &c. p. 12, 13.

|| "Who knows," asks the author of the *Recherches Historiques*, (p. 8,) "if, after M. Muston, the Vaudois will not turn out to have been an antediluvian people?"

¶ Hist. des Vaud. liv. i. p. 8; liv. ii. p. 92.

Walter Scott or Byron, never a Homer has conceived scenes more sublime;" nor ought this to startle our belief, for they are the annals of a people whose very valleys are stored with "rocks which are poems, and whose history, when most naked of incident, is a temple which men nor time cannot destroy!*" The list, however, of authorities, is strangely scanty for a people so well provided with literature. Of the existence of writers living about the different times, which they are pleased to assign to their sect for the epochs of its origin, they do not even profess to have heard, and the first books of recognised dates which they cite upon their side, are, strange to say, those of Rainier and Polichdorf, and other Catholic writers of various dates, which are commonly produced as in the present article, to prove their descent from a rich merchant of Lyons! To these we must add two undated or misdated documents, a *Treatise on Antichrist* and the *Nobla Lëizon*, both in manuscript, for which they claim an anteriority, that we shall presently notice, of only fifty years for the one and seventy years for the other, over Peter Valdo! But then they are strong in assertion, powerful in traditions unvouched, in possibilities and likelihoods, dexterous in wresting "line upon line,—here a little, there a little,"—from the pages of succeeding Catholic writers,—to their own purposes; and above all, marvellously fortified in the possession of certain rules of criticism so peculiarly their own, that none but a Vaudois would ever think of challenging them for himself. Then again they rival Mrs. Malaprop herself "in retrospection of the future," and appeal for aid whenever they find themselves at fault to the Protestant writers of the last three centuries, who, upon their side, nothing loth thereat, "anticipate the past," and supply their protégés with as much evidence as they choose to call for. No wonder that a friendly reviewer, great in the service of Anglicanism, and deeply sympathising with the Waldenses, should have found that the works assertive of their venerable antiquity,† served to excite rather than satisfy curiosity."

Id verius quod prius. So thought the Vaudois, so think the Protestants, and hence the absurd and incoherent story which their writers rave of, who would link the latter to the former, and these to the Apostles. Even if they had succeeded they would have been in no better plight than Simon Magus and his followers formerly were, since antiquity and apostolicity mean two things in tradition and succession too, widely different from each other. Then again, while the possession of Vaudois

* Liv. i. p. 37-40; pref. p. vi.

† British Critic, vol. i. p. 379.

allegiance offered a passage into Italy for reformation enterprise, and assured its leaders, too, of four centuries of antiquity at least, even though they should fail in the more important aspiration,—the Vaudois, who, at that time, had nearly verged upon the annihilation which ever attends on heresy, saw the immense advantage accruing from a junction with Swiss cantons and German princes, whose arms might serve them in time of need. But as this union of parties required something more than the evident policy of the arrangement to make it palatable to the world, the zeal and skill of either were taxed to the uttermost how to supply the ominous silence of history in their regard, and to encounter without defeat her testimony against them. Leaving the natural inference to the reader, we proceed to examine the account which the modern Waldenses give of themselves. “Why should I wish to refute again this ridiculous idea,” demands M. Muston of himself indignantly, “that in the deep bosom of these mountains, where they existed before him, our Vaudois have owed their origin to the *Reformer on the Banks of the Rhône?*” “Poor Valdo!” says the witty author of the *Recherches Historiques*, (p. 83,) “well may’st thou say with some others, *filios enutrivit et educavit, et ipsi spreverunt me!*” “We possess,” says M. Peyran,* “many authentic manuscripts which contain the doctrine of the Vaudois, and which are all anterior to Valdo; in the one which is dated 1120,† (*Treatise of Antichrist*,) we read the causes of the separation of the Vaudois from the Roman Church; Valdo, then, who lived fifty years later, is not the author of this separation; in another dated in 1100, (*La Noblu Lëizon*,) we find the word Vaudois employed as synonymous with ‘virtuous Christian;’ it is not then from Valdo, who lived seventy years later, that the Vaudois have received their name; they must have borne it even before the twelfth century, since, already at that epoch, they were known and decried under that name, as men who led a life different from that of other Christians.” In this judgment his worthy colleagues perfectly concur. And yet, with respect to the *Treatise of Antichrist*, we find M. Muston, after having been reduced to reject the *Spiritual Almanack*, and *A Confession of Faith* of 1120, as spurious documents, expressing himself thus wisely in reference to this one also:—“As to the book on Antichrist it offers many features of the manners of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, but, it must be confessed, we have not of its authenticity either proofs

* Peyran, p. 27-8.

† Léger gives sometimes this date and sometimes 1126, pp. 71, 83.

quite incontestable."* In fact, the authorship of this precious document has been abandoned by Perrin, the Vaudois historian, to Pierre de Bruis, the founder of the sect of Petrobrusians; while the author of the *Recherches Historiques*, upon collating it with the books which contain the doctrines of the Cathari, pronounces it to have been written by one of that body of heretics. At all events, it contains not a single characteristic doctrine of the Vaudois, and has even excited the bile of M. Muston, who observes that a passage of the book, "where that verse, fundamental for the Roman Church, *Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church*, is taken in the same sense which Catholics give to it, that is to say, that they interpret it as if St. Peter had indeed received from Jesus Christ a marked superiority over the other Apostles."† Be that as it may, the book, whether written by Vaudois or Cathar, or disciple of Bruis, bears on its face its self-conviction as to date, in citation of the work called *Milleloquium*, which it attributes to St. Augustin, and which unluckily is only a compilation from the works of that Father,‡ made between 1243 and 1328, the respective periods of the birth and death of the compiler, Augustinus Triumphus. Alas for the *Treatise of Antichrist*!

Come we now to poetry. The *Nobla Lëizon*, we learn in the pages of M. Bert, is a manuscript poem containing the doctrine of the Vaudois, whom it styles by that name (Vaudès) sixty years before Valdo appeared.§ M. Peyran has already told us that it bears the precise date of the year 1100. Notwithstanding that the character in which this poem is written, and of which a very neatly executed fac-simile has been given in the *Recherches Historiques*, (p. 255,) is pronounced by palæographers of learning, to belong to the thirteenth, or at the very earliest, to the twelfth century, we are bound to pay all due credit to the expressed date, if any there be, until we light upon such an unhappy anachronism as that which appears in the *Treatise of Antichrist*. But, in fact, no date at all is to be found there! Those who assert that there is, point to the two lines in the body of the work,

" Ben ha mil e cent anes compli entierament
Que fo scripta lora car seu al dernier temp,"

and insist upon it that they are equal to the same thing. But they are not so. The writer, alluding to a notion which formerly was rife among Christians, that the end of the world was

* Muston, p. 134.

† Ibid. p. 106.

‡ See Cave's Scriptor. Eccl. Hist. Litter.

§ Le Liv. de Fam. p. 19-20.

to happen at the end of the year 1000 of the Christian era, and warning them that it had only been delayed, begins thus: "There are quite 1100 years entirely complete since it was written that we are at the latter times." Did he mean that there was not a fraction more than 1100 years passed, or would he not have said precisely the same, notwithstanding the number of years short of a century, elapsed since the *complete* period of 1100 years, just as we at this day talk of the eighteen centuries that have passed since the birth of Christ, or the nineteenth century, which now is, taking no thought of the fraction of thirty-seven years which follow the one, or of the sixty-three years which remain to complete the other? Then again does the writer say that the "1100 years entirely complete" were computed from the Christian era? Does he not on the contrary altogether exclude this interpretation, by expressly limiting them to commence from the time when the prophecy was supposed to have been written,—in other words, from the date of the Apocalypse? Our own countryman, Mr. Hallam, certainly not particularly inclined to do justice to Catholic historians and chroniclers, when confronted with those of our enemies, has already examined this pretension and rejected it as unfounded.* So have Fuesselin and Gieseler (writers of great credit with M. Muston†), and so has Shæckh. Mr. Lowther believes it to have been the work of one of the Cathari; be it so. In that case, there is more reason for his Vaudois to blush than to plume themselves on the praises bestowed by its author on their fathers' morality. And thus much for the only ancient documents which these primitive people can produce in support of their high antiquity, the groundwork of M. Muston's argument, "the proof which enables him to dispense with all other arguments, and its date, whereof if any man shall doubt, there will be nothing upon which henceforth with a little good will, men may not doubt here below."‡

But Rainier Sacco, it seems, is to relieve them from their embarrassment. In the *Liber contra Valdenses*,§ after speaking of the Manicheans and other sects, he says, "Among all those sects which exist yet, or are already extinct, there has been none more fatal for the Church than that of the Leonists, and this for three reasons. *The first is that it is the one which reckons back the longest duration; for some say that it dates from the time of S. Sylvester; others from the time of the Apostles.* The second reason is that it is more widely spread,

* Europe in the Middle Ages, t. iv. p. 271, 2nd note.

† Liv. ii. p. 137-141, (notes.)

‡ Pp. 136, 138, 140.

§ Reinerii Cont. Vald. lib. cap. iv. in Bibl. PP. t. xxv.

there being scarcely a country where it is not found.* The third, lastly, is that while the other sects inspire those who hear them with horror, by the grossness of their blasphemies against God, this one, on the contrary, displays a great appearance of piety," &c., &c. . . . "Note that the sect of *Poor Men of Lyons*, who are also called *Leonists*, arose in this wise. While the richer citizens of Lyons were together, it chanced that a certain one of them died suddenly in their presence. Whereat one among them was so terrified that he immediately devoted a large sum to the poor. And upon this a very great crowd of poor flocked to him, whom he exhorted to hold voluntary poverty, and to be imitators of Christ and the Apostles. But as he was somewhat lettered, he taught them in the vulgar tongue the text of the New Testament, for which rashness when he was reprimanded, he became contemptuous, and began to insist on his doctrine, saying to his disciples, that the clergy, since they were of wicked life, envied their holy life and doctrine (!) But when the Pope launched against them the sentence of excommunication, they pertinaciously despised it, and so even till this day in all our borders do they increase their doctrine and rancour against us. Note three things; first concerning the blasphemies wherewith they blaspheme the Roman Church and its statutes and all its clergy. In the second place are handled their errors about ecclesiastical sacraments and the saints. In the third place, note all the curses with which they curse all the honest and approved customs of the Church. In the first place, they say *that the Roman Church is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but the Church of malignants; and that it fell away under Sylvester*, when the poison of temporalities was infused into the Church, *and they say that they are the Church of Christ*, for they observe the doctrine of Christ's Gospel and the Apostles in word and deed."†

The passage in italics from chap. iv. is that on which the hope of the Vaudois, a most forlorn one it must be confessed,

* What will the Vaudois say to this passage, depriving their mountains of the privilege of having been that land of Gessen which "preserved the Christian rite and doctrine in all evangelic purity and simplicity, while the thickest darkness covered the rest of Europe?"—(Brez. Pref. pp. xii. xiii.) We may, in part, perhaps, deliver them from their dilemma, by hazarding the very probable conjecture that *Leonist*, applied at first specifically to the Vaudois, became afterwards a generic term for all heretics. Just so in latter times, the word Protestant, originally and strictly too, belonging to the Lutheran protesters, became adopted by every mad-brained sectary that followed in the track of disobedience. And yet the Lutherans adhere to the word as their own, for it is no uncommon occurrence to hear an Anglican, for example, talk of Protestants, meaning Episcopalians, as distinguished from the children of Knox.

† Chap. v.

is for the present founded. To those that are familiar with their writings, it will not be a matter of surprise that not a single author of their body, after quoting it in turns, has thought proper to give either of the two passages which we have connected with it, because they follow it and explain its real signification; nay more, that M. Muston is the only one who has ever dropped a hint of the existence of any such opposing authority. But with their aid, no less than by the literal wording of the passage itself, it becomes evident that the antiquity of the sect was asserted by the Leonists themselves, and not by Rainier Sacco, and that on the contrary, after having exposed the true extraction of the sect, he treats the pretension as one of blasphemy against God and his Church. We cannot clearly see, for our part, why M. Muston and his friends should lay such stress upon the verse in question, because the utmost effect which they can ever hope to produce by so much toil and ingenuity, will be the simple neutralization of Rainier's evidence on either side of the debate, a result, however, which they will never succeed in obtaining.

But M. Muston gets over the whole difficulty, he tells us, by contesting altogether the authenticity of the writings of Rainier, those very writings to which he refers the corroboration of his own crude theories, and attributing this collection of traditions to a stranger, most probably! In the next place, he says that the Leonists were not Vaudois, but the disciples of Valdo, and that Rainier was wrong to confound the two. Yet he accepts, in more than the strictness of the letter, the testimony of the *some*, recorded by Rainier, to the antiquity of these Leonists, as being tantamount to a like testimonial in favour of those Vaudois! Moreover, this same M. Muston and all his fraternity are ever the readiest upon all occasions to seize on the identity of meaning between the words *Vaudois* and *Leonist* as peculiarly favourable to the development of one of their fables, which they have erected into a theory which we shall touch upon in the sequel. It is equally inconceivable to us that this band of writers should have judged the occasion one, which even with Mr. M'Ghee, would justify the "ingenious device," by which they have managed to divide Rainier Sacco into two persons,* for the multiplication of testimony, and leaving to the real or Italian Rainier, the authorship of that one of his two works which we have just cited, attribute to the shadowy or German Reinerus that of his other work the *Summa*. For in that work the favourite passage on which they love to gloze,

* For an account of the exposure of this curious imposture, see the Rech. Hist. p. 177.

appears not, nor any passage approaching to it in terms or in the interpretation which they give it; while on the other hand, Rainier is here more precise than ever on the identity of the Leonists with the Vaudois, or Poor Men of Lyons. Take for instance the following:

"In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whereas the sects of heretics heretofore were many, which have been nearly altogether destroyed, by the grace of Jesus Christ, yet now are found two chief ones, whereof one is called the *Cathari* or *Patarini*, the other *Leonists* or *Poor Men of Lyons*, whose opinions are noted in this present page."*

So that Peyran and his brethren have presumed too much upon the well-understood identity of Rainier and Reinerus, or rather, they have unwittingly assented to our interpretation of the passage in the *Liber contra Valdenses*, in asserting that "the" (imaginary) "German Doctor says absolutely the same things and nearly in the same terms, as the Italian inquisitor of the same name!!"

As to Polichdorf and the other Catholic writers, whom the same men falsify and affect to cite, we have not space to follow them through their forgeries and their punishment. But as the former author is the only contemporary of Rainier whom they have dared to quote, we shall simply add that their "venerable" Léger (for no one since his time has been rash enough to name that Catholic historian) here presents us with a counterpart to his own candour and that of his brethren in the case of Rainier above commented on. For Polichdorf, who gives the same account of the Lyonnese origin of the sect, had thus commenced the subject:

"The birth and origin of the Waldensian heretics were thus: although these sons of iniquity may lie before the ignorant, saying that their sect has lasted from the times of Pope Sylvester, to wit, when the Church began to have property; this the heresiarchs repute unlawful," &c.†

The veracious Léger thus *paraphrases* the above contemptuous notice of a falsehood, which the want of ancestry had naturally, even in Polichdorf's days, suggested to the sectaries, when preaching to the ignorant:

"The great doctor, being unable to find the origin of this sect, advances nevertheless, as a belief common even among the Vaudois, that they were at least from the beginning of the sixth century!"‡

But it is painful to linger over this system of fraud, since it

* Summa F. Reinerii de Ordine Fratr. Præd. De Cathar. et Leon. Seu Paup. de Lugdun. Thesaur. Nov. Anec. t. v. pp. 1759-60.

† Petri de Polichdorf Contra hæresim Valdens. Tract. Præf. cap. i. in Bibl. P.P. t. xxv.

‡ Liv. i. c. xxviii.

it is impossible to expose it in detail, without feeling ourselves indignantly impelled to give at every instant the *menti par la gorge*. To sum up succinctly, then, all the *tours d'artifice* of these gentry, who having not an ancient document of their own, and finding no mention of their sect in even Catholic writers earlier than the close of the twelfth century, are reduced to make the most of any loose, strained or misquoted passages, which their watchful perseverance may seem to have extorted from these, we shall spare ourselves the trouble of any farther elucidations of Vaudois dishonesty, by this time pretty well established in the minds of our readers, and present them with the following passage from the Catholic pages of the *Recherches Historiques* :—

“ We have seen that they rely on Rainier to mount back to St. Sylvester, and Rainier replies to them that their pretension is nothing less than a *blasphemy*, and he refers them to the *citizen of Lyons who had given birth to their sect*. They run to Æneas Sylvius (Pius II) and this pope, who knew that they had been condemned for nearly 300 years, gives them no other satisfaction than that of making known to them that *they have been a long time condemned*. They run to Seyssel, and Seyssel maintains and proves to them, that they *utter fables* that are not even *probable*, and which cannot impose but on those *who understand nothing in matter of history*. They invoke Cassini, they make him say that they are members of the Christian Church, and that they are as ancient as that Church ; and Cassini replies to them that he knows but one Church of Jesus Christ, that it is the Church Catholic and Roman, and that the Vaudois have never belonged to it. They turn themselves to Belvedere, and he answers them but by facts and dates that overthrow irretrievably their pretensions. They address themselves to Roremo, and Roremo, ascending to their origin, places it clearly at the end of the twelfth century, and leaves them only in uncertainty on the date of the later epoch, when they penetrated into the valleys in which they pretend to believe themselves established from the time of the Apostles. Finally, they come to Campion,* to Gretzer and to St. Bernard ; now it is enough to glance at the text of these authors, to see, 1st. That Léger has confounded designedly, the epoch of the institution of the order of the Jesuits with that of the Church, to make Campion say that the Vaudois are more ancient than the Catholics, whilst he only says that they are anterior to the Jesuits. 2ndly. That Gretzer treats as an *absurd fable* a certain pretension, which in M. Muston's words, he would not have dared to deny. 3rdly. That St. Bernard, finally, has not written a line, a word against the Vaudois ; that these are nowhere named in his works, and that he has refuted different heretics, of whom none belonged to the sect of the Vaudois.”†

* The glorious martyr of Elizabeth's reign in England.

† Rech. Hist. p. 236.

We have now done with the muniments of title, printed and manuscript, ancient and modern, forged and genuine, that Vaudois ingenuity has been able to amass, in proof that they hold "the faith once delivered to the saints." Let us now hear the judgment passed upon them by one of the most laborious of these collectors, the often-quoted M. Muston.

"The loss of all the old documents of the Vaudois," he says, "takes from him the means of reproducing their immediate succession from the first centuries, it deprives him of sources direct and positive from which he might have drawn. It will be necessary then to beg of all the centuries some superficial testimonies escaped here and there from their annals, and it will not be without difficulty if he shall succeed in drawing forth some rays of truth Many among these citations have not a great authority, but they have been destined in this case to make known the style and the opinions of their authors."

He confesses that "a necessary uncertainty" reigns in his work; "that the result of his researches will not be absolutely unassailable," and that his opinion, however "demonstrated," will be only "extremely probable," or even a "simple probability."* "When an author judges thus his own opinions, he spares others, at least, the trouble of reproaching him with his inconsistencies and his contradictions: *mentita est iniquitas sibi*."†

But their arms have not yet failed them. They have etymological and chronological reasons against the paternity of the despised Valdo. The authors who have written his eventful history were not at all agreed about the spelling of this surname; nor is it wonderful, for they were of different nations, and each latinized the dissyllable after his own fashion. Thus we have Valdo, Waldo, Valdio, Valdensis, Valdesius. To these M. Peyran adds Baldo, but as, unluckily there is no authority for this reading, we let it pass, though it might easily come under the same category with the others. Now the mighty argument which these writers draw from this astonishing fact, is, that a man with a name so variously spelt could never have existed at all, at least, as founder of the Vaudois. If so, Heaven preserve the future immortality of our gallant countryman, the Duke, from the annihilating etymology of continental newspapers! Dr. Flathe,‡ whose work we have perused with attention, in the disappointed hope of finding something better than the sweepings of Vaudois printing rooms, hazards a new argument, of much originality doubtless, upon the strength of Peter's surname, against the paternity of the

* Pref x. and pp. 34, 109, 386.

† Rech. Hist. p. 293.

‡ Vol. i. p. 296.

Waldenses. He tells us that the supposed name of Valdo, if borne at all, must have been a surname; that in the twelfth century there were no surnames, and that consequently the Vaudois could not have derived their name and descent from the Lyonnese merchant. Were there indeed no surnames in those days? St. Francis, commonly called of Assisium, born in the twelfth century, was son of Peter *Bernardone*, and St. Clare, his co-operator in the foundation of his order, had the family surname of Sciffi. What, too, was Sacco, the *postnomen* of Reinerus, not to speak of the local surnames bestowed upon every person of fame for greater distinction? Let the Doctor only run his eye over the list of Catholic writers whom we have produced, and he will find Stephen of Belleville, Alan of l'Isle, Eberard de Bethune, Peter of Vaucernay, &c. But then, says Dr. Flathe, there is no such place in the neighbourhood of Lyons as the town of Walden, whence Peter is said to have taken his name. Few have attempted to ascertain the town which was thought worthy of that honour, but the better opinion is, that Polichdorf, who fixed on Walden, was quite wrong, and that Vaud, a small village near Lyons, was the place. Others name the city of Valdés, in Flanders. But we believe that his manes have not been appeased with the like contention among cities which followed the funeral of the Grecian bard. We would remind the Doctor, too, of the sect of Petrobrusians, contemporaries or predecessors of Peter Valdo, who received their name from their founder, Peter de Bruis. Here is an instance of a Coryphæus giving his Christian name and his surname to the children of his unbelief, and that too of the twelfth century.*

So, too, (M. Peyran *loquitur*,) "the historians by no means agree with regard to Valdo; some say that he appeared in 1160, others in 1170, others in 1175, others again in 1180."† Therefore there never was a Valdo, or being a Valdo, never one who could lay claim to be the founder of the Vaudois. To this argument, repeated and relied on by Muston, we might reply that if it have any force at all, it must go the extent of denying the existence of Waldo at all; which neither Flathe nor any other sensible historian has thought of doing. But, we will content ourselves with observing, after the intelligent author of

* It is ludicrous to hear the Doctor exulting in the exact conformity which the doctrines of the *Nobla Lièzon* bear to those asserted by Vaudois polemics to have been professed by the imaginary Leo in the days of St. Sylvester. One is reminded of the infamous Lord Howard of Escrick, in the witness box on Sydney's trial, professing his amazement at the unity of truth, as instanced in the agreement between the evidence of the last crown witness, and that which he was about to deliver.

† Ap. Rech. Hist. p. 138.

the *Recherches*, that even admitting the variation as charged, an event so historically authenticated as the rise of the Vaudois in Lyons under Peter Valdo, is not to be enfeebled by an uncertainty of even twenty years as to the date of its occurrence, but that, in fact, the greater part of the historians do not pretend to fix the epoch to a precise year, always employing the word *circa*, when they mention it; and that between the most discordant of the other writers in this regard, there is *not* a question of even twenty years. Besides, the rise of the sect was gradual, its beginnings were good, and it was long before it emerged fully from obscurity: it might well, therefore, be difficult to choose the point at which to designate its first passage into the way of heresy.

But we are as fatigued with this desultory trifling as its authors ought to be, and we seek to know their own etymological derivation of the name of their sect. M. Peyran and his fellows, after "the judicious Theodore Beza and Cougnard, advocate to the parliament of Normandy," (!) resolve the difficulty by tracing the word to the Latin, *Vallis*, and the French, *Vaux*; (which latter, by the way, to make it more peculiarly their own, they represent as being a word from the *patois* of their country,) and hence they say, Vaudois in French, Valdensis in Latin, and Valdesse in Italian. "This name, which only seemed at first to distinguish the Vaudois from their neighbours, was afterwards employed to denote their religious belief, so that a Vaudois was at the same time a dweller of the valleys, and a Christian who rejected the traditions of Rome."* Now, besides that Léger in a remarkable passage (liv. i. ch. 11,) admits that this view of the case is possibly not older than the Reformation, and that Mosheim, Basnage, Hallam, and the better informed Protestant historians, treat it as wholly chimerical, and give their support to the claims of Peter Valdo to the sponsorship of the Vaudois, there are two objections to this theory, as the author of the *Recherches* has observed: 1st. That it proves too much, 2ndly, that it rests on false premises. In the first place, if the name Vaudois became the distinction of the sect on the supposed apostacy of the Church of Rome, it follows that the name must have been already known in the fourth century, if we are to take that period for the date of their separation, or in the ninth century, if that be the preferable one. Nay more, the *patois* itself, whence the name is supposed to be taken, must have been already in a state of development at one or other of these early periods. Is this sought to be main-

* Peyran, p. 31.

tained? If not, and no earlier warrant for the term is to be found than in the twelfth century, of what service to the cause of Vaudois antiquity is the etymology of Beza and the advocate to the Norman parliament? But secondly, this etymology is far from being established. The name of Vaudois, so understood, would surely have been in its origin common to all the dwellers in the Alpine valleys. Now of these the actual Vaudois lay claim to no more than the three valleys which they still inhabit. But there are many more such, embedded deeply among the windings and undulations of the Alps, as long cultivated, as well peopled, and possessing a patois very nearly akin to that of the Vaudois of Piedmont. If the theory were good for any thing at all, it would have appeared that not only the latter, but all their fellow-mountaineers did once, at least, if not now, rejoice in the same name as themselves. It would then, of course, be essential to prove that they too held the faith of the Apostles, apart and in hostility to Rome, otherwise the unity of the Vaudois, in matters of faith, so strikingly evinced by the application of the territorial name to the religion of the sect, would be sadly compromised with sympathizing Protestants. But as the difficulty would be much too great for their writers to grapple withal, they have wisely let that increment alone, and taken up with an incomplete theory for want of it. It is scarcely necessary to add that no authority whatever is quoted for this etymology, but two are falsified, that of Foncald, who derives the name of Valdenses from *vallis densa*, in order to raise thereon an allegorical reflection after the manner of the middle age, upon the dark vale of death, to which the sectaries had devoted themselves; and that of Eberard de Bethune, who reports another allegorical saying of the Vaudois themselves, "that they so call themselves, because they make profession of living in this world as in a valley of tears." But this valley of tears is not confined to the three valleys of Piedmont. There is all the difference besides in the world between a term allegorized and the same term received in its actual meaning: they have nothing in common but their sound. We must therefore conclude the theory unsupported by authority, notwithstanding the sacrifice of good faith.

But though every evidence should fail them, we are assured that the vulgar opinion of their apostolic origin, of their descent from the imaginary Leo, the opponent of St. Sylvester, and of their descent from Claude of Turin, is quite sufficient to justify itself. For this they choose to term tradition, and while they upbraid it in the Catholic Church, they commend the good Vaudois that relies on his own traditions of apostolic ancestry,

—even if unsupported and refuted. Thus Muston, after contesting the authenticity of Rainier, restores his credit with his Vaudois readers, when he wishes to turn him to the profit of one of his many conjectures.

"After all, it is not so important to know who may have compiled the traditions which are there preserved; enough for us that they existed then, and that they have come down to us; it little matters by the pen of what writer this transmission is operated."*

Hence also the reason why the impudent pretensions advanced by the rebellious Vaudois, in their petitions to their sovereigns, have been also relied upon by Muston, Peyran and Company, as so many *proofs* of their apostolic antiquity. Conjecture, too, is sometimes brought in to relieve tradition.

"Without pretending to fix the epoch when the dwellers of the valleys received Christianity, we may nevertheless make in this regard the following conjectures, which are quite possible. . . . I confess it, they are but conjectures, but it will be felt that in the events of such high antiquity, and on which we absolutely want historical data, positive proofs ought not to be exacted."†

And it is upon a body of such contemptible trash as the foregoing, put forward boldly as evidence, that the Vaudois writers hope to continue to mislead their dupes, in the delusion of an apostolic antiquity. Would they were only agreed upon their story! Léger and the earlier ones contented themselves with one genealogy, still entertained by their descendants, those even not excepted who have introduced other schemes of ancestry inconsistent with it. Judging with other heretics that opposition to the Holy See is always a great point gained towards proselytism on their own side, and seeking for some distinguished example of "the progressive element of opposition which develops itself in the north of Italy, . . . and of the inveterate heresy which conceals itself in the Alps . . ." they first fixed their eyes on Claude, the Iconoclast Bishop of Turin, in the ninth century, and after apparently little scrutiny, chose him as the starting *terminus* of their genealogical line. He was a prelate of the Church, who at one time, of course, had been in her communion, and was therefore a proper link to bind them to the first eight centuries of the Church and her apostolical succession. This they endeavoured to effect by proclaiming an exact correspondence of doctrine between the bishop and themselves. But this they have never proved, for the fraud is an impracticable one. Claude was an Iconoclast, and condemned as such alone, and his violence in putting his

* T. i. p. 117.

† Peyr. pp. 32-33.

cold heresy into force, was worthy of the sect whom he served. Nor were the people unmindful of his actions: his death had hardly taken place before every sort of indignity was shown by the multitude to his corpse, till finally they consumed it with fire to prevent its receiving burial, and scattered its ashes to the four winds of heaven. But to establish their descent from this man, the Vaudois writers ought to have made him the depositary of more false doctrine than that of Iconoclasm, and have shown him teaching and confirming disciples, who were to become his successors in after days, and by whose means would be supplied the links which are still wanting to connect the worthy prelate of the ninth century with his Vaudois friends in the sixteenth. This they have not done.

"But, is it true that the Vaudois are disciples of Claude in this sense, that, at the epoch when their sect appeared, they faithfully adopted all the doctrines which he had professed? Not even so. 1st. Claude called St. Peter the Pastor of the Church of the new alliance, thus designating him as chief of the society established by Jesus Christ. Do the Vaudois recognize in him this title, and this authority? 2ndly. Claude, whose errors we know by the refutations made of them by different contemporary writers, and by the fragments of his writings which remain, has never been accused of having denied a single one of the seven sacraments, received then, as to-day, in the Church Catholic. Do the Vaudois receive them, and are they in this his disciples? 3rdly. Claude knew not the authority of the Spirit, or of private judgment, in interpreting Holy Scripture; he protests, on the contrary, that *he holds to tradition, and to the sentiment of the Fathers who have preceded him*.* Is this also the rule the Vaudois follow? 4thly. In a word, with the exception of honours paid to images and relics of the saints—of their invocation—and of pilgrimages of piety, which Claude rejected; with the exception of the erroneous doctrines which he had imbibed in the School of Felix d' Urgel, and for which, some of his contemporaries regarded him as Arian, others as Nestorian; Claude thought on all the rest of doctrine as the other bishops of his time. . . . Do the Vaudois do the same, and are they of accord with us on all the points in which their pretended patron was? No, doubtless. By what title dare they then call themselves the disciples of a man, whose doctrine they combat on many more points than they admit it? Every one can judge."—p. 326.

Having disposed of the genealogy, which the Vaudois are fond of vindicating among themselves, we come now to the more venerable one which they claim, when they find themselves in the lists with Catholic antagonists. We mean the fable reported of old by Rainier, "*in which*," says Polichdorf, "*they lie to the simple and the ignorant*." Leo, they tell us, was a certain

* Vetera Analecta 92. Præfat. Exposit. in Epist. ad Ephes. ad Lud. prim.

person who lived in the pontificate of St. Sylvester, but of whom all history is silent; which Leo was so scandalized at the conduct of that Pope, in accepting a pretended donation of temporalities in the Church's name, at the hands of the Emperor Constantine, and so apprehensive of the danger which the Church had incurred by her alliance with the state,* that he separated himself from her communion, and hence the Vaudois or Leonists. Now, it is most unfortunate that Léger, the one of modern critics who dwells most upon this incoherent attempt to provide a better derivation for the name Leonist, than Leona or Lyons will give, seems to credit it the least, and to lean rather to the story of Claude of Turin, for he opens the fable of Leo, by asserting, that inasmuch as Rome was till that period quite pure and stainless, the Churches of the valleys might well remain in the *seventh* century allied to Rome, and therefore, "up to the seventh century, it would be absurd to demand proofs of the Apostolic succession of the Vaudois Churches of the valleys." But when the period of corruption came, they broke off from her communion. "This is what I shall prove more clearly than the sun, to have happened from the end of the EIGHTH century."† The only commentary on the foregoing, is the fact, that St. Sylvester lived in the FOURTH century! But Muston tells us that he accepts the story as a *tradition*, and on this tradition, he builds another of his conjectures, which is,—that during the persecutions under Decius and Valerian, a large body of Christians, from France and Italy, came to the Cottian Alps for shelter; that they were not disturbed there, because, 1st. The Celtic inhabitants civilly withdrew about the time of their arrival. 2ndly. Decius himself could not follow them, being engaged with the Goths in Pannonia, and there defeated. 3rdly. The Huns, the Vandals, the Heruli, and the Lombards, paid no attention to "these little communities, living peaceably among the Alps;" and that, finally, as the date of their arrival tallies very closely, according to Muston, with the supposed

* Surely the Vaudois have swerved from this noble example of disinterestedness. Their ministers at this day receive salaries of no small amount from the King of Sardinia! Nay, more, when the French rewarded their treasons with the tithes and goods of the Catholic parishes of Luzerne, St. Martin and Inverso-Pérouse, and the administration of the Hospice of Pignerol for their own profit, unmoved by the imminent danger to which they exposed the Churches of their pastoral care, they submitted to these decrees with a wonderful degree of resignation. (See Maranda, Tableau du Piémont, &c. Turin, l'An. xi.) But will they, at least, tell us, that his apprehension of future harm could, in any case, justify the imaginary Leo's apostacy? Or will the Church of England patronise in the Vaudois the principle, that separation from the Church is lawful, whenever the Church enjoys temporal advantages from connexion with the state?

† Liv. l. ch. xx.

separation under Pope Sylvester, so old an historic monument as the tradition of that event, tells very strongly in support of his conjecture !!

For farther confirmation, he finds, among other positions,—upon the strength of *thirty-four words* of Latin extraction, selected from the valley patois, four of which more nearly approximate to the Latin than their synonyms in any other patois—1st. That the idiom of his three valleys is much more Latinized than any other idiom, “from the mountains of the Tarentaise and the Maurienne, to those of Nice; and also in Piedmont, Provence, and Dauphiny.” 2ndly. That the Christian emigration came from the bosom of Latinity, “in a time when the Latin language was in all its vigour,” which he learnedly concludes, *must* have been the era of Decius and Valerian !! * *Ohe ! jam satis.*

Tendimus in Latium: we are still progressing towards the most ancient times of Christianity, and even to times more ancient still, as we proceed with our investigations. M. Peyran, despairing at last of finding any evidence elsewhere, has opened the sacred volume, and has there read :—

“When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain, *I hope that as I pass, I shall see you*, and be brought on my way thither by you, if first, in part, I shall have enjoyed you. But now I shall go to Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. . . . When, therefore, I shall have accomplished this, . . . *I will come by you into Spain.*”—Rom. xv. 24-28.

Therefore, says M. Peyran, St. Paul must have taken his journey into Spain by way of Rome—he must have gone by land thither—he must have passed through Piedmont, and he must have visited and made converts of the Vaudois! Now, the three first assumptions are by no means clearly established to our minds; and as to the last, it requires a separate chain of testimony to arrive at it, seeing that it in no wise depends—a necessary conclusion—from the demonstration of the other three, even were that effected. But, in the first place, there is no evidence that the Apostle fulfilled his purpose; secondly, had he done so, he would have found the sea-voyage the most customary and the most practicable one; thirdly, he might have crossed Italy, without passing by Piedmont—Liguria offered him a shorter road, and mountains less difficult to pass. But, fourthly, even in the other case, he might have crossed ten times through Piedmont or Cisalpine Gaul without touching on the obscure and unfrequented valleys of the Vaudois, which offer,

* Muston, 98-100.

for the most part, no outward passage to the traveller who enters them.

The anxiety of our Vaudois writers to banish the Gospel to their own valleys, is explained, by the ambition of appearing to have been for so many ages the closed repository of faith. The language of grandeur which they affect on this subject in every page, will excite the smiles of our readers, who have traced with us the ludicrous records of their vain imposture.

"When all was accomplished," says Muston, "that is to say, when the treasure of the Gospel had been deposited in their bosoms, the vessel was closed! The valleys beheld all their foreign communications broken off. The precious deposit of the old religion was not altered; it was preserved in the peaceable forgetfulness of our valleys; and when the time was come, men saw it go forth by degrees from these mountains, like the shining chrysalis, which shakes off the gross covering that encloses her, where they had deemed her dead, and where she had only imbibed a life more beautiful."*

The acting cause of this marvellous preservation, it seems, was—

"The Jungfrau of the south, the mighty genius who watches over the valleys: for it is in the shadow of her wings of granite, that the torch of the Gospel had sheltered her brightness. They extend their gigantic sweep in long chains of mountains which sway the whole horizon."!!†

There is a Vaudois petition extant, drawn up and presented, as Léger tells us, by himself, to Emmanuel Philibert; setting forth a claim to Judaic antiquity, we suppose, for it ends thus; "it is the religion of our fathers, and of our grandfathers, and of the grandfathers of our grandfathers, and others more ancient; our predecessors; and of the holy martyrs, confessors, apostles and *prophets*."‡ We think that this effort, at least, admits no more competition on the part of his brethren in bidding for antiquity. Bossuet, however, might furnish them with a lineage older, if not more desirable. The Albigeois, or new Manichæans, those especial favourites of their own friends the Calvinists, and in all probability their own early allies, possess an antiquity, according to the Bishop of Meaux, such as it would be more suitable to take away from than to add to, if it be true that the seed of their doctrines was sown by Plato.§ Now let MM. Muston and Peyran, once clearly establish that Peter Valdo was a Manichæan, and their genealogy is made at once à merveille. Or we recommend them to "Brute the Trojan,"

* Liv. II. 89.

† Liv. I. p. 8.

‡ Lég. liv. I. ch. xxvi.

§ Hist. des Variat. liv. xi. § 7.

through whose antique line Edward I made out his claims to Scotland. Or there is the strange knight in the *Morte d'Arthur*, with his memorable reply to the inquiring Sir Garrain, sprung surely of a lineage more excellent and renowned by far than any of their sober truth-telling history can give. Like them, too, he avowed himself "an enemy to Rome," by family feud of long standing. "My fader is lyneally descended of Alysaunder and of Hector by ryghte lygne, and Duke Josue and Machabeus were of our lyneage." A genealogy infinitely more illustrious than that they have made pretension to, and every whit as authentic!

To attempt an epitome of the religious doctrines professed by the Vaudois, is, in fact, to give an ever-varying record of the effacing of dogmas from the symbol of the sect, and the substitution of others in their stead. Our readers will remember, that until the censure of the Church had branded the superstitious observances of Valdo and his people, their design was evidently no other than to keep well with the Church, and even to illustrate it by the intervention of the new order, which they flattered themselves they were likely to become. Many of his disciples, even, applied to Innocent III to confirm their vows, and establish them as a recognized order; but the Pontiff, blaming their practices, as we learn from the Abbot of Ursperg, and from Ivonet, refused them his countenance, and approved in their stead of another religious order which had just risen, that of the Poor Minors.* Valdo, finding from his condemnation by Pope Lucius, and the Archbishop of Narbonne, as well as from his own rude expulsion from Lyons, that he stood in palpable opposition to all authority in ecclesiastical discipline, first commenced his operations in the field of schism, by affecting to deny episcopal authority altogether, and by continuing to preach in defiance of all inhibition. To this, his disciples added the usurpation of the confessional, and of the Eucharistic consecration, as open to all who wore the sandals of the sect, and were in grace before God. They proclaimed all oaths unlawful, as well as capital punishments. The Church of Rome was pronounced not to be the Church of Jesus Christ, and their sect alone was declared to merit this character. Towards the epoch of the fourth Council of Lateran, however, by which they were anew condemned, they had borrowed new doctrines from the heretics

* This application to the Pope has been represented by Vaudois writers to have for its object, the permission to preach and perform other church offices, independently of Episcopal authority; and, according to them, the request was granted. As a proof of the falsehood of this pretended concession, see Innocent's real sentiments on the question, as displayed in his Letters, lib. xiii. ch. 94, p. 460.

with whom, as we have seen, they had allied themselves against the Catholic Church. By this time, they had, in imitation of the Albigeois, their Perfects and Imperfects, and a code of morals for each class. The contemporary writers agree in representing them as entertaining, in addition to the above doctrines, the following.—Though every falsehood and oath was accounted sin, yet it was held by some, that an *imperfect* might lie, or take an oath to save himself from death. They denied purgatory and prayers for the dead. The priesthood, with the power of forgiving sins, was held to be common to both sexes, and the portion of every good person, *eo instanti* that he or she should attain to the state of grace; and on the other hand, a sacrament was null if administered by an immoral priest. All those engaged in wars, whether against Christians or Saracens, were denounced as homicides. All clerks and priests who held possessions were accounted as children of the devil; and payers of tithes or offerings were also condemned as sinners; and all divisions of land among individuals, and all natural distinctions, were equally forbidden. Church-chaunts were pronounced insults to God, and all the ceremonies and rites of the Church were made the objects of derision. Invocation of saints, reverence of images and relics, observance of fasts and festivals, and obedience to the Roman Church, whom they styled the harlot of the Apocalypse, were prohibited. Divorces were tolerated, at the sole option of either party, without the necessity of any pretext whatever. Finally, they professed to rely on the naked language of Scripture, unassisted by authority or tradition.*

Now, there is not one of the above doctrines for which the Vaudois can claim the merit of originality. 1st. We have the errors of the Donatists, on the nature of the Church, and the nullity of the sacraments in the hands of bad priests. 2ndly. Those of Vigilantius, on saints and relics. 3rdly. Those of the Iconoclasts on image-worship. And the one solitary doctrine, that the Church ought not to be possessed of riches, was the recent work of the two heresiarchs, Marsilius and Arnaldus of Brescia.

"We may even go farther, and maintain, without the dread of being deceived, that of all the errors into which the Vaudois are fallen, there has not been one of which they can claim the *merit of discovery*. They have drawn them all, not from the writings of the old heretics, such as Donatus, Vigilantius, and others, but from among the heretics who had appeared in the same century with themselves; such as Marsilius, Du-

* The authorities for this view of the Vaudois, may be found collected in the Rech. Hist. p. 413, and seq.

randus of Valdach, Basil, Pierre de Bruis, Arnaldus of Brescia, Henricus, the Apostolicals, and the different sects of the Albigeois. There remains then to the Vaudois, in this regard, only the privilege of having preserved, even to the Reformation, heresies, which, at that epoch, were already extinct among the sects from whom the Vaudois had borrowed them."—p. 422.

Of all the seven sacraments, the Vaudois rejected Order alone; and, this by treating it as an accompaniment to the state of grace in both sexes. Auricular confession they practised not only among themselves, but also in the Catholic Churches. Polichdorf tells us that their ministers were wont to counsel them not to tell their greater sins to the priests, for fear of being brought *before the bishops after the usage of Christians, to be confounded before them, and despoiled of their money by the priests whom cupidity devours*. Flathe and others of their friends intimate that this conformity was practised as a cloak to their real opinions. But what an impression does this theory produce of the honesty and courage of these primitive Christians of the valleys! Extreme unction they only rejected because they were poor, for they averred that it was reserved for the rich, and not imparted by the priests to the poor also. Confirmation they admitted, but denied that none but bishops could administer it, and they received it from their ministers and their laymen quite indiscriminately. In the Eucharist they denied a transubstantiation until the moment of reception by a communicant in the state of grace. Among the many other doctrines of a trivial cast, which they professed to build upon Scripture, we find the following:—

"We see that it was a matter received into a maxim and an usage among the sectaries, to turn into derision the practice of the Catholics of building churches and meeting there for divine office. They regarded them as objects useless and superstitious, and gave them only the names of barn or granary, saying that it was much better to pray in a stable, in a room, or in a bed, than to go to church. Also they blamed those strongly who founded or endowed churches, or gave them legacies, or any donations whatsoever. The clergy, according to them, ought not to have any prebend, any endowment, any fixed revenue. The priests ought all to work with their hands, and had not the right to live but at this price. It was offensive to God to secure to them a rent, or revenue, or stipend of whatever kind it might be.* . . . It was the same with cemeteries. They said that it was better to be interred any where than in the place blessed and destined for the common sepulture of the faithful. Also, they interred their ministers in their caves, in their cellars, or in any other place whatsoever, rather than in a cemetery. The religious

* "It is certain that the Vaudois ministers in our times have made the most complete abjuration of these doctrines."

chaunt of our churches was, according to them, only a *barking of dogs*, and all the prayers which are recited there, were not worth one solitary Pater Noster recited in bed or elsewhere. The use of bells and belfries, destined to warn the faithful of the hours of assemblage in the churches, was the most superstitious thing imaginable. They showed no more favour to colleges, universities, and to every sort of studies, regulated and privileged. All this was, in their eyes, only folly, vanity, and loss of time. . . . They comprehend in the same anathemas, synods, councils, and every sort of ecclesiastical assemblies."—p. 437.

The above doctrines seem to have been professed with but little variation down to the sixteenth century. At this period, the ignorance and indifference of the people who held them, seemed to promise the same quiet death to the errors of Valdo, which had befallen every heresy in its turn that had ever arisen within the Church, and which the heresies of the sixteenth century are themselves doomed to undergo. But the Reformation, with its rise of new sects, more powerful and more numerous than themselves, and their establishment in Switzerland and Germany, awoke them from their apathy, and tempted them to seek an admission, at the price of conformity, into the ranks of the recent rebellion. It was true, that there was as much opposition between their own heresy and that of Calvin, as already had separated them from communion with the Church Universal. But long supineness had rendered them indifferent to orthodoxy, and they were prepared to welcome any change but that which should bring them back to Catholicity, the object of their endless hatred. Besides, their historian, M. Muston, boasts that "the Vaudois never had their dogmatic opinions so inflexibly decreed by formulas and human authority, as they were after the Reformation. . . . Also, it is proper to admit, that they do not appear to have always understood one another in a definite manner upon these particulars." Accordingly, the deputation which they sent to Œcolampadius, to treat of the union they desired to effect with the Calvinist body, after setting forth that they were much agreed with the reformed Churches, consulted him upon a variety of questions of doctrine, on which they were not sufficiently certain. Among these were the following: whether the distinction of sin into original, venial, and mortal, were good; and also that of ignorance, into invincible, negligent, and gross: how they were to distinguish the ceremonial and the political precepts; and whether they had been all abolished by the coming of Jesus Christ: whether the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures were admissible, and what were the canonical books of the Old and New Testament. As little informed they seem to have been on the question of morals, for they asked him if it

was justifiable to assassinate the false brothers, who sometimes betrayed their ministers to the Catholics. These questions were headed by a methodical statement of their opinions and practices, which, it is remarkable, differs only in some trifling points with the account which we have already copied from the contemporaries of their first founders. The last article of the summary, too, admitted, that by weakness, or dread of their persecutors, they caused their children to be baptized by the priests, and themselves communicated at mass.* The result, of course, was their submission to Geneva,—precipitate, complete, and unconditional. "*Their habitual humility*," says Muston, "*and a distrust of themselves*, pushed too far, led them to admit opinions, which they at first rejected."—p. 350.

Elsewhere, this author characterizes this complete abandonment of Peter Valdo for John Calvin, as "*some modifications conformable to the rites of the reformed which the Vaudois worship has received since the fourteenth century*" (p. 107), and "*as innovations introduced into the Vaudois discipline*, probably by condescension for the Reformers." (Pref. p. xiii.) The amalgamation, however, was complete. Henceforth, the valleys were Calvinistic, and the Vaudois peculiarities vanished into thin air. The permission of the princes of Savoy was sought, and sometimes obtained, for the erection of churches and belfries, and the suspension of church-bells; and cemeteries were opened for the Genevese mode of interment. Moreover, Geneva beheld the Vaudois youth, candidates for the ministry, crowding to her seminaries for that instruction which their forefathers would have censured as heathenish. We have already seen that these would-be successors of the ancient inhabitants of the valleys, required only the opportunities, which Jacobin confiscations and royal munificence have since afforded them, to prove that they were ready even to forswear the apostolic poverty which their ancestors enjoined to Churchmen up to the sixteenth century. At the present day, these ministers have shared the common destiny of Geneva; Socinus and not Calvin is the object of their love, and under their guidance the hapless three valleys seemed doomed to undergo a third religious revolution. In the meantime, they are happy in being the objects of sympathies manifold and various. The Oxford divine, who believes himself the best medium between superstition and infidelity, venerates the Vaudois because of their episcopal and apostolic succession from the fourth century, which, in his fancy, he gives to their

* See the whole of this curious document, with the proceedings thereupon, in Reichat's Hist. de la Reform. en Suisse, tom. iii. lib. vii.

ancient Church; and if they have abandoned these high privileges for the "cold porridge" of Geneva, he hopes that heaven and the Church Missionary Society may do much to restore them. The Scoto-Calvinist and Independent exult in the living negation afforded by this democratical Church of the valleys to the Episcopalian challenge of Christian antiquity. The Unitarian, in no wise solicitous for the past, yet smiles to see another prize falling almost into his arms; and hails the glorious future which awaits the Vaudois at the end of their perilous wanderings. Of these, we believe, the Unitarian's expectations the best-founded. The tone of the Vaudois writers, whom we have analysed in this article, is certainly such as would find favour in the halls of modern Geneva. For M. Muston, the Trinity is but "the dogma formulated by Theophilus of Antioch, and published by Tertullian.....supported on a passage the interpolation of which is at this day recognized." (Liv. iii. p. 100-1.) This same minister of the gospel in another place (Liv. i. 46) thus gives his views on the rule of life: "These little distinctions (*religious* differences) established among men, and by men, exist not before God. The manner in which we shall have done well, according to our heart, reason, and conscience,—this is the only rule after which all his children will be judged." What! the only rule! is the gospel left quite out of the question? and "Little matters it," he says elsewhere, "what worship rears its altars, provided that it be to the same God." (Id. p. 35.) Alas! what a departure from the unction, force, and eloquence with which that holy man, Robert Olivetan, the contemporary and kinsman of Calvin himself, warned the Vaudois of his day against the danger of remaining without the pale of their Church, then recently renewed by the Calvinising process. Hear him offering to the Catholic Church the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and then blush for the degenerate Muston.

"Poor Church! the people which makes thee this present has seen thee, not certainly without great regrets and compassion, in the service of rigorous and unkind masters, enjoining and commanding thee a thousand things to be done one after the other: it has seen thee go, come, run, trot, and bustle; ill-treated, over-driven, ill-accounted, torn, soiled, scratched, dishevelled, chilled, murdered, mutilated, beaten, disfigured, and in such piteous state, that we should rather have judged thee some poor servant, slave, or scullion, than the daughter and heiress of the universal ruler and possessor, and the well-beloved of his only Son..... What charge and load of weighty constitutions has he (thy friend) seen thee draw before thy most religious masters; thou hast no sooner discharged the one than they have reloaded thee with the other; and these good men commanded that thou shouldst fast the greater part of the time, and all to advantage and profit the insatiable appetites

of such gluttons, and slow bellies, and evil beasts.....Now then, poor little Church, which art yet in the state of servant and housemaid, through all the furious faces and magisterial threats of so many grim and sour masters as thou hast, go and rub clean thy rags, all dusty and clayed from having so much run, turned, and bustled by the miry way of vain traditions; go wash thy hands, which are all dirty from doing the servile work of iniquity; go cleanse thine eyes, all bleared by reason of the negligence which thou must have had for thyself to be more diligent after the wants of superstitions and hypocrisy: dost thou prize more the sophistical bawlings and troubles of these hairbrained men, than the pleasant dialogues and conversation of thy friend Jesus Christ? Forget only thine own, and the house of him whom thou hast holden for thine own (to wit the Pope), and that traitress of a stepmother whom thou hast long called mother (to wit the Roman Church), and come boldly with them who have made themselves execration for Christ, not for their misdeeds, whose titles are these, to wit: insulted, blamed, driven about, decried, disowned, abandoned, excommunicated, anathematized, confiscated, imprisoned, tormentingly confined (*géhennés*), banished, laddered, mitred, bespitten, scaffolded, cropped of ears, pincered, branded, fired, drawn, roasted, stoved, burned, drowned, beheaded, dismembered, and other like glorious and magnificent things of the kingdom of heaven!"—p. 282.

One word as to the pretended persecutions of the Vaudois, and we shall close this lengthened article. The reproach comes with an ill-grace from English Conservatives, with Ireland before their eyes. Those whose fathers carried fire and sword into Innisfail to implant there a faith foreign as themselves, would have no right to complain even though the Dukes of Savoy had in reality with fire and sword resisted that immigration of outlawed French in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which bore with it into Piedmont a new creed in religion as in morals, in social relations as in civil allegiance. And if at the present day in a kingdom which still does not enjoy the blessings of a constitution, there remain some privileges open to the other subjects of Sardinia, but forbidden to the Vaudois, they are not competent to deplore the harsh injustice of that exclusion, who battled with all their might, till resistance became bootless, against the admission of Catholics to the common liberties of their native land, and that too a land which prides itself on the possession of the freedom its Catholic sons once shed their blood to maintain. But we do not rely upon this obvious answer to the Anglican railers at Sardinian intolerance, preferring to deny the charge in the terms in which it is couched. We say, then, that the Vaudois irruption into the mountains of Piedmont, would have passed unnoticed by the sovereigns of Savoy, but for the general confusion and havoc which every where marked its traces. The

jealousies between the native Savoyards and the new comers, between the teachers of new and seditious doctrines and those who held fast their old faith and time-honoured allegiance, begat a succession of disturbances which wasted the strength of the state, and called forth prevention and punishment. Add to this, the constant rebellions fomented among the Vaudois by their ministers, authorized by their own doctrines, and speculated on by the foreign foe, and we have at once a very sufficient reason why the rulers of that frontier state, the dukedom of Savoy, should interpose with summary vigour, and even with severity, to crush the serpent rather than to scotch it. Let us remember, that among the doubts which *Æcolampadius* was requested to resolve, there was one, whether the civil laws which regulate the world are approved of by God,—that the division of the earth into distinct kingdoms, and of men into peoples and nations, was reprobated as sinful,—that they forbade the custom of property among their faithful,—that they condemned oath-taking as mortally sinful,—that they treated as an assassin the judge who condemned another to death,—that they denounced as murderous all who were engaged in a war however just,—that they proclaimed all popes, emperors, kings, and princes, who should act otherwise in these particulars than they would have them, as indubitably damned,—and that, finally, they exerted all their zeal, and all their influence, to propagate generally these doctrines, so incompatible with the welfare, or even the existence, of society. Let us call all this to our recollection, and we shall not wonder that the Dukes of Savoy have done their best to discourage the profession of Vaudois opinions, and to circumscribe the sectaries in their means of mischief. In general, Botta, the historian of Italy, misses no occasion of doing despite to the Catholics, and giving praise to their enemies; but of the Dukes of Savoy, even he has been constrained to say:

“These religionists, tolerated at first sufficiently peaceably by the princes of Savoy, while they remained in quiet, were afterwards combated when they became turbulent and put forth greater pretensions, at the example of the wars which had broken forth in France in consequence of the reformed religion. The power which the Huguenots had acquired in struggling against the sovereign power, served the Vaudois at once for example and support. Thence it happened that these valleys, which had before been sufficiently tranquil, and had even been able to furnish a peaceable and sure asylum to the Protestants, who fled the persecutions which they had endured in France, became troubled and filled with blood, by discords the most terrible that ever mortals have had to suffer.”—*Lib. xxxv. p. 35.*

We have already noticed the loyal and patriotic part which the Vaudois took during the passage of the French army into

Piedmont. We, of all men, are no advocates of exclusive systems; but we cannot help feeling, that the Sardinian government had some justification for its system of caution and prevention, when we witness the base and venal adhesion of this people, as of one man, to the French standard, against their sovereign and their own mountain independence. The endowments which the new government, on its establishment at Turin, heaped upon their pastors, tell pretty plainly under what influence the treasonable junction was accomplished.

The same conqueror who slew old and young unarmed in the streets of Drogheda, remonstrated against the severities of the Duke of Savoy to his Vaudois rebels. It answered a purpose. And the orangemen of our days pause from the soothing remembrance of Rathcormac and Iniscarra, and from the anticipation of future fields of equal slaughter, to lift up the voice of indignation and mourning over the fancied picture of Vaudois suffering. The party palate must be gratified; and truly the caterers are not idle. Enter the library of the British Museum—you will see them there each with his quire of foolscap spread before him, and at his elbow a host of works penned and published on his side of the question years ago, but now dead and forgotten; biographical dictionaries and encyclopædiæ complete his munition. From these he is culling, with all the spirit of penmanship, whole passages of a length so formidable, that in a few days he has obtained almost sufficient matter for his single duodecimo volume, hot-pressed, and quite enough to authorize his publisher to announce the approaching appearance of a new work on the Vaudois, or on the Albigenses, or on the Culdees, or whatever else the subject may chance to be. That any such will take the trouble to peruse our pages,—or, perusing them, will have the candour to abate their foregone conclusions,—at least, until they have made the experience of a more careful search into authorities,—we cannot hope. Our purpose is not with them, but with their readers. If we shall have been the means of putting them in possession of a more honest and unglossed account of the state of the Vaudois question, than they are likely to derive from the shallow pages of English polemics, or of pointing to those sources of information whence a purer truth may be imbibed, than their Gillys will supply them with,—we have not in vain assayed the reviewer's duty, in the hope of introducing to their notice the valuable work which we have had such frequent occasion to quote in the most unqualified spirit of approbation.

The above article shows the true Catholic animus

ART. IV. — 1. *Contrasts, or a Parallel between the Noble Edifices of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, and similar Buildings of the Present Day; shewing the present decay of Taste.* By A. Welby Pugin, architect. 4to. Lond. 1836.

2. *A Reply to Observations which appeared in "Fraser's Magazine" for March 1837, on a work entitled "Contrasts."* By the Author of that Publication. 8vo. London. 1837.

MR. PUGIN is an architect of acknowledged merit, and of established reputation. He is one of the many who have been, in late years, attracted to the ancient and true Church, by her secondary prerogatives of taste, beauty, and surpassing grandeur in her outward forms; and who, approaching her nearer, and discovering in her all that can satisfy the intelligence and the heart, as well as charm the sense and the imagination, have sought and found their happiness in her bosom. Within these few months, we have observed the *Siècle*, a notorious French paper, accuse M. von Haller of having joined the same Church, rather from an admiration of its social and political principles than from a conviction of its doctrines,—rather as a publicist than a theologian. Let not Mr. Pugin, then, feel other than flattered, if a similar charge has been made against him by a journal* too well known for its habitual, amiable candour, to be believed by any one when it treats of Catholics. The "*Contrasts*" is a book full of life and spirit, and amusing, though unto sadness. It is a "comparative anatomy" of architectural science. It does not represent this science through its different stages, such as was naturally to be expected, as a growing, perfectible science, of which the later periods display a grander or chaster development of artistic principles than the earlier. On the contrary, it exhibits the same members and forms as were once joined together in all the symmetry of fair proportions, now clumsily hung to one another in monstrous shapes and ill-assorted connexions. It shows us, if we may so speak, the organs of social life, through which alone, as a moral, or a political body, a nation can live or breathe, in its religious and public edifices,—once adapted most perfectly to every required end,—noble in their development, sound in their structure, and healthy in their action; but now presenting no trace of fitness, beauty, or design, to prove that the "*mens divini*" has any part in contriving or producing them. If the light,

* "*Fraser's Magazine*," March 1837.

symmetrical, elegant form of the antelope, be contrasted with the awkward, cumbrous, and disgusting configuration of the sloth, there will not be a greater dissimilarity of similar parts, a wider disconformity of adaptation to the same actions, nor a greater impossibility of referring the two to the same class or genus, than there is when we compare the architecture of the two periods selected by Mr. Pugin.

But his plates present us only the phenomena, of which we naturally desire an explanation. It is true, indeed, that the eye decides almost intuitively. Each plate presents a double view of some public edifice, such as it was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and such as it is now-a-days constructed. We begin with the most solemn part of a cathedral, its altar. On one side is the exquisite screen of Durham Abbey, not as now remaining after the ravages of Iconoclast reformers, an unmeaning fabric of matchless tracery, but all its niches filled with holy images, the altar restored, and the priest celebrating thereon the august mysteries: such, in short, as the faithful saw it in 1430. Beside it stands the chancel of Hereford Cathedral, such as modern taste has made it, be-pillared and be-pannelled with broken entablatures, pediments within pediments, but without cornices, a mere piece of carpenter's work, with a mean cloth-covered table, on which, as on a *buffet*, are displayed the flagons and salvers of the communion service. Who sees not that one is a Catholic, the other a Protestant, cathedral? Next come parochial churches; *here*, from the wide portals of an ancient church, streams forth a picturesque procession, and pours over the flights of steps, which give a nobler elevation to the massive tower and lofty building; *there*, from the shade of Nash's disproportioned circular portico in Langham Place, topped by the unimaginable ugliness of his column-girded "extinguisher," trips out a slender congregation. Who can doubt which is the Catholic, and which the Protestant parish?

Of the next plate, "Contrasted Royal Chapels," we are not sure that the attorney-general ought not to take cognizance. It is evidently Mr. Pugin's intention to bring royalty into contempt. What else can he mean by exhibiting to the public a chapel royal, which he pretends is to be seen in the heathenish Pavilion at Brighton, looking to all intents and purposes like a concert-room, with a double gallery, supported by spindle columns, narrow overgrown pilasters, shooting up the walls to the ceiling, and a ball-room assembly, met, to all appearance, not so much for worshipping God, as for hearing man, under the form of a portly dignitary, who, perched in a lofty pulpit, is no doubt preaching on the duty of mortification. Now, this

reasonable representation is rendered doubly evident by the juxtaposition of fine old Windsor chapel, as it used to be when its choristers and clergy sung there the solemn mass. What is this but a clear insinuation that the presence of royalty itself can hardly throw an interest round Protestant worship, when performed in the temples which itself has raised, in true accordance with its own tasteless forms; while the sublime functions of the old church exactly harmonize with the character of those solemn and sumptuous edifices which it erected? The one thought only of making a chapel for a king, the other, of raising a temple to God.

Sometimes we are really inclined to suspect Mr. Pugin of more occult, but not therefore the less dangerous, malice. When we look at his "*Contrasted Public Conduits*," we cannot resist the temptation of believing him to have in his eye a most wicked allegory. It is plain, that the beautiful, ornamental fountain, ever affording living waters to those that seek them, without effort and without price, symbolizes the old and generous religion, under whose domination it was erected; while the ungraceful, stiff, selfish-looking pump, with its handle chained down, and the child that comes for water, chid and sent elsewhere by its legal guardian, the policeman, while a long list of fees for ecclesiastical rites stares from the wall, is no unapt emblem of the law-established Church. But what shall we say of his "*Contrasted Episcopal Residences*?" On examining this plate, we know not whether indignation, or pity, or contempt, be the uppermost feeling in our minds, towards the degraded taste of our country, which could allow such a mansion as old Ely Palace to be sold, pulled down, and replaced by the mean brick buildings of Ely Place; but, at the same time, it does not at all surprise us, that a bishop who has daughters to bring out, and sons to get into the Guards, should have considered a Gothic house in Holborn a vulgar bore, encumbered, as it was, with cloisters, libraries, and large chapels, and preferred a neat, three-windowed house, in a more fashionable neighbourhood. Still, it argues great want of tenderness in Mr. Pugin, to contrast the two so prominently, seeing that the difference of taste has arisen from such delicate feelings of parental solicitude as we have alluded to. For, it is evident, that a married bishop must have "nursery windows;" and, as Mr. Pugin himself tells us, that "the great test of architectural beauty is the fitness of the design to the purpose for which it is intended; and that the style of a building should so correspond with its use, that the spectator may at once perceive the purpose for which it was erected," (p. 1) he must own, that the Bishop of

Ely's *genteel* house in Dover Street, is a much better architectural specimen of what a Protestant bishop's residence should be, than the cloistered palace of Holborn, which clearly belongs to times when bishops gave hospitality, afforded means of study to poor scholars, were daily seen at public prayers, and gave a third of their incomes to their children, the poor,—things utterly useless now-a-days, as long as we have plenty of inns, abundant reading-rooms, and sufficient poor-rates.

It is, therefore, sufficiently plain, from the bare inspection of Mr. Pugin's plates, that he means us to infer, that the decline, or rather the barbarization, of our national architecture, is traceable to the change of religion in our country, commonly called the Reformation. His text, however, more fully explains his object, if any explanation be required, and presents a bold and masterly sketch of the changes which that unhappy event introduced into his noble science. He glows with an honest and merited indignation, in contemplating the sacrilegious and barbarous scenes of early Protestantism, its mutilations, its desecrations, its spoliations and destructions, worse by far than ever Goth or Vandal perpetrated in a Christian land. He comments with deserved severity and sarcasm upon the modern successors of the race, who have done almost more, by avaricious neglect, to destroy, or, by ill-judged restorations, to deface, the remnants of our once glorious cathedrals and churches, than the fanatics who first assailed them. He proves, what every one's eye must readily convince him of, that the ancient cathedrals are every way unsuitable for Protestant worship, and that, even after they have been cut down, boxed off, and made what is called comfortable, they are still unfit for the purpose to which they are now applied.

In fact, it is evident that the Catholic and Protestant religions have two essentially different principles of worship, and two different standards of proportions; both of which must necessarily influence the form and characteristics of their religious edifices. The worship of the Catholic Church is based upon the belief in rites and practices, endowed with essential holiness, and capable of communicating this quality to external objects; that of the Protestant, entirely on the uncertain influence of a human agency. Take the clergyman out of his pulpit and reading desk, and there is nothing in the parish church which warns or invites the members of his flock to kneel and pray. But the Catholic peasant goes not past the door of his church without an act of reverence; the traveller, who enters it through curiosity, kneels for a brief space to pray, before proceeding to examine its paintings or tombs; and this at a time when no

service is actually performing. And why? because the belief in a sacrament wherein our Blessed Redeemer is ever present, inspires a reverence for the entire temple in which it reposes; the very celebration of its solemn mysteries leaves a savour of holiness throughout the building, which renders it, through the day and night, a holy place. In like manner, if we suppose the Protestant preacher to be indeed in his desk, but one of the congregation placed at such a distance as not to hear a syllable of what he says, for example,—just entering at the western door of a cathedral, while service is going on beyond the screen,—there is no common tie between the two, and the stranger can no more be a partaker of the worship than if he were outside the church-yard. On the other hand, if the Catholic have passed the threshold of the vastest cathedral, and see the holy sacrifice offered upon its most distant altar, he will kneel in adoration, sensible that he has come into the presence chamber of the King of Kings. Hence it follows, that to places of Protestant worship, it is the limited faculty of hearing that must suggest proportions; while the sight, almost boundless and quite insatiable, the boldest and divinest of the senses, gives the standard of measure and proportion to the Catholic temple. When our ancestors knelt upon the battle-field, during the celebration of mass, there was a sublimity in the simultaneous act of adoration directed by thousands towards one object, which their eye could reach: whereas, were it desired that a modern Protestant army should be made to pray before risking their lives in battle, it would be necessary for each regimental chaplain to read the service separately to his corps, if, indeed, it would not be necessary for each company to have prayers by itself. Wherever Protestants have to build churches or meeting houses, the first object in view has necessarily been, that the preacher should be audible in every part. This rule is incompatible with grandeur of dimensions or proportions; it imposes the necessity of introducing galleries, which destroy the unbroken loftiness of a building, and, what is still worse, makes the clergyman instead of the altar the principle object of attention. Where they have overlooked their proper standard, as when they built St. Paul's, or adopted our old cathedrals, they have necessarily reduced the body of the edifice to the degraded condition of a vestibule to the chancel, wherein alone are performed acts of public worship. But in Catholic countries, as once in our own, every foot of the building, from wall to wall, and from pavement to ceiling, belongs to God, and is consecrated to his worship. The threshold is as secure from profanation as the sanctuary; the sister arts are engaged to decorate the walls

which architecture has raised, from the door to the altar, though with due subordination of parts; and the eye finds all that it desires,—not only grandeur of design, but corresponding magnificence of execution.

Perhaps we have been unjust to Mr. Pugin, by substituting our language for his, in thus delivering our sentiments. He has indeed done ample justice to his subject; and shown, by the warmth of his expressions, that he has deeply drank of that enthusiasm which ought to be a characteristic mark of distinction between the architect and the builder. The writer in *Fraser* was probably unable to comprehend this feeling: to him it could only be an object of ridicule. The “Regent Street” school—the aspirers after commissions to build streets at so much per yard, and to erect nondescript churches, that must return, by their sittings, so much *per cent*—could not be expected to trouble their heads about the holier appropriation of their art, but must have been astonished how any one could have been led, by professional study, to examine into the uses and purposes of our venerable cathedrals, and so to ascertain the grounds of doctrines which could alone have inspired the idea of such glorious edifices. Hence the groundless, and really ungentlemanly, charge made by the reviewer, that Mr. Pugin had returned to the faith of his fathers—the source of every pure artistic inspiration, only from a love of architectural magnificence. There must be a sad dearth of topics for real censure, when a reviewer descends to such unwarrantable attributions of unworthy motives, for acts accountable to God alone. But the critic, not so content, sends Mr. Pugin for information on the Catholic religion, to a work which maintains the emblem of the Holy Ghost, mentioned in the New Testament, to be derived from Venus’s dove; the eagle, characteristic of St. John, from the bird of Jove; and the lion of St. Mark, from that of Cybele! Such is the learning, antiquarian and theologian, of the critic in *Fraser’s Magazine*!

But there is another charge made against our author, by his critic, on which we intend to enlarge more fully, because we have noticed frequent misapprehensions on the subject, both in books and conversation. Mr. Pugin is in love, as he should be, with the pointed architecture. Now this just admiration of the sacred architecture of his own country, is distorted by his critic into a condemnation of every other style. Nay, he is charged with even treating disrespectfully the magnificent basilica of St. Peter’s at Rome. There is not a line in the “Contrasts” that can warrant this malignant charge; nor should we notice it but

for the mistakes which we see daily committed on this very subject. Again and again have we been provoked by finding our best friends unable, or unwilling, to afford room in their minds for a two-fold admiration of objects, each perfect in its kind, because each the perfection of principles essentially just, and brought by ages of experience to a full maturity. To our ears, the wish that St. Peter's at Rome, or the cathedral of Pisa, had been built in the pointed style, sounds as harsh and absurd, as a regret, were such expressed, that York cathedral or Westminster Abbey was not erected of the Corinthian order. The arts of a country are part of its social growth—they follow step by step the progress of a nation in its advance and decline; and to transplant its principles from one country to another would only be to rear an exotic that must dwindle and degenerate.

We do not mean to say that one country must not borrow from another; the pointed architecture, whatever its origin, spread from country to country; and England, France, and Germany, have respectively produced specimens worthy of being considered models. But then each of these nations enjoyed a perfect community of ideas with its neighbours, upon every point which could suggest artistic principles. The same feudal system required baronial castles of the same form; the same religion called for the same arrangements in the Church, the same symbolic decoration, and equal vastness of dimension. Each too had to choose its architectural forms, for there was no previous system in their countries to imitate or improve; their architecture arose with Christianity; and though its first and ruder forms were drawn from Roman specimens, as Dr. Milner has proved,* yet this rude germ received its development, growth, and perfection, from causes which could not have produced the same effects in Italy.

This observation calls for farther explanation. No one who has examined the point can for a moment doubt, that what is called the Saxon order, that is, the semicircular arch resting upon thick pillars, with lighter pillars running from these to the vault, is borrowed from Italy. This will appear more probable, from what we shall say in the sequel. Now in Italy, the style of architecture thus copied was a degradation and corruption of one older and fairer; in the North it was a first essay, the adoption of a fundamental principle. Without rules extraneous to itself, without a knowledge of the earlier state from which it had degenerated, even without models by which to restore it, our ancestors could not possibly have thought of going back from it

* Treatise on the Ecclesiastical Architecture of England, p. 23, seq.

to an older style; but had only the natural course before them of straightforward improvement, of studying the capabilities of the system which they had adopted, of discovering in it new and rich combinations, of giving it airy lightness and elegance, and more strange than all, of basing upon this very quality a character of sublimity and grandeur, which till then had been considered the result only of massiveness and colossal bulk. And right marvellously did our forefathers achieve all this, and even more. For they invented a new system of ornaments, and other adjuncts of matchless beauty, but imagined in a spirit of essential harmony with the greater members of their architecture; inventions truly of the highest order, whereof not a hint was derived from anything that had gone before; the window glowing with transparent mosaic—the flying buttresses, like wings that by their lightness seem to bear the huge fabric into the air, yet knit together its limbs in everlasting strength—the purfled pinnacles, which, rising from every prominence of the walls, and topped by their flowers or *finials*, break and conceal, as with a parterre, the monotony of the roof: in fine, the tapering spire, which appears to connect the earthly edifice with the higher sphere, scarcely seeming to press upon the massive tower that supports it.

In Italy, however, it was far otherwise. The style of architecture, from which the pointed sprung, served there to recal the mind of able men to the earlier system from which it had itself arisen: for the history of preceding styles was traceable through monuments of every age, back to the purest forms. The study of these begot in them the desire, not so much of basing a new system upon what they possessed, as of restoring, as far as was compatible with circumstances, the ancient rules. They felt as we now do upon the same subject. For the monstrous abortions of modern architects, intended for pointed architecture, only inspire one who loves art with an anxiety to see a return to the noble and beautiful style of which they are degenerate imitations.

But to elucidate this matter more fully, it may be useful to run hastily over the history of sacred architecture, and explain the various causes which operated upon it, and worked out, in the end, the two great modern systems, of the pointed, and what we shall call the Italian styles. To such as have not travelled, it may be necessary to explain, that by the latter we understand the plan adopted by Sir Christopher Wren in St. Paul's; that is, when the nave is separated from the aisles by wide arches, between which are pilasters, or perhaps half-columns.

As the Jews, under the direction of God, adopted Egyptian

forms in the architecture of their tabernacle, and later of their temple, as being those to which they were most accustomed, so was it to be expected naturally, that the early Christians would select from the edifices which surrounded them the types of their new ecclesiastical buildings. Only such writers as Middleton or Blount could be unreasonable enough to imagine, that Christianity imposed the necessity of inventing new styles of architecture, lest it should appear to have adopted anything, however innocent, from heathenism. However, for the consolation of such as have made to themselves a bugbear of all that pagans ever did, we may repeat what is pretty generally known, that the ancient Christians, not considering the general form of heathen temples suitable to their worship, nor their dimensions equal to their wants, preferred the *Basilica*, or court of justice, for a model. It was reserved for the builders of new St. Pancras's, and some other London churches, to make their edifices look as much as possible like a pagan temple, even to the adopting of caryatides to support their tasteless side-porticoes. Agincourt, whose splendid "History of Art" is lying before us as we write, very reasonably supposes, that Constantine, before laying the foundation of his many splendid churches, would first consult the Supreme Pontiff respecting the requisites for such buildings, the proportions and parts best suited to the rites therein to be celebrated. It would be seen that the Basilica possessed all the important features required; for it consisted of a parallelogram, divided into three unequal breadths by two rows of columns, and ending in an apsis or semicircular recess. This served for a chair in which the bishop and other officiating ministers sat: the altar being between them and the people. The Church of St. Agnes, near Rome, is a basilica of this form, built by the first Christian emperor; and exhibits all these parts, as they were first arranged. It has also the singular feature of an upper range of pillars, that form a gallery without disturbing the simplicity of the edifice.

But the early Christians, in thus building churches upon the basilican model, were not guided by a poor spirit of imitation. They modified their type so as to give it a grandeur of dimensions never attempted by their heathen forefathers, and a still greater adaptation of parts to the forms of their religion. The architects who planned the old churches of St. Peter, St. John, and St. Paul at Rome, must have been men, who, if cast upon times when a happier execution of details was practised, would have been immortalized by their works. They prolonged the building to a length unknown in previous times; doubled the orders of columns, and consequently the number of aisles; they interposed

between the body of the church and its semicircular termination a noble transept, which gave the form of Christianity's symbol to its churches, and they united this new part to the nave by a bold triumphal arch, as it was called, corresponding to the arch of the apsis, and enriched, like it, with glittering mosaic. In all this there were essential deviations from the form of the old basilicas, sufficient to warrant our considering the plan of the larger churches as of purely Christian origin.

But, at the same time, it was natural that, when such edifices were erected, the rules of architecture then in use should be applied. Rome had already begun to fall into decay, and many of its enormous edifices could not be kept in repair. Their very use in heathen times rendered them almost useless now; theatres and amphitheatres were but little encouraged by the new faith of the empire; *thermæ* or baths had been multiplied beyond the wants of the diminished population, and were edifices destined rather for effeminate luxury than for wholesome recreation. While these and similar buildings, tombs and temples, presented an inexhaustible store of sumptuous materials for building, it required but little sagacity to perceive, that the decayed state of art, even in its most purely mechanical departments, would not allow anything to be produced approaching to them in perfection. Hence the plan was adopted, which the Arch of Constantine proves to have been followed in profane monuments, of seizing on the materials which older edifices afforded. When cornices as well as pillars were at hand, the two were joined together, and the colonnade presented the general features of the more ancient portico. But, on many occasions, as in the churches before mentioned, preference was given to the plan which had come greatly into use in the reign of Dioclesian, of throwing arches from pillar to pillar, and drawing either a complete entablature, or a slight cornice, over them. This arrangement shocks, it must be owned, a classical eye; but still deserves no small indulgence.

In the first place, the spirit of the Christian worship sought for elevation in the interior of its buildings, far beyond those of heathen times. This could never have been attained by having a single colonnade, and then the ceiling, as in Grecian and Roman temples; for the tallest order would have been insufficient to reach the elevation attempted in the large Christian churches. An immense height of wall or attic was, therefore, required between the entablature and the roof, to raise the latter to its proper elevation, such as would destroy proportion between the columns and their superincumbent weight, at least as far as the eye is concerned. Notwithstanding the unparalleled beauty of *Sta. Maria Maggiore*, no one can fail to be struck with the great

distance between the cornice and the ceiling, and to feel that the colonnade is crushed by the high wall above. Either, therefore, the grand feature of loftiness was to be sacrificed to the laws of pagan architecture, or these must be somewhat modified. The early Christians never would have dreamed of the first alternative, they were therefore driven to the latter. Now, by turning arches over the pillars, and thus elevating the cornice, a fairer proportion was obtained between the parts below and above its dividing line. Secondly, we think any lover of art will pardon this departure from ancient classical rules, when he considers that in all human probability, we owe to it entirely the modern systems, whether pointed or Italian. We unhesitatingly say, that had the classical system been still followed, of horizontal entablatures resting upon the pillars; in other words, had not arches been thus early introduced into church architecture, all sorts of incongruities might, indeed, have been committed—even Boromini's monstrous perversions of the old orders might have been introduced; but the first step would not have been made from which, by a series of natural gradations, arose the magnificent glories of our northern style, and the classical though original beauties of Brunelleschi's, Bramante's, and Michelangiolo's, compositions. Nor can we conceive by what other course either of these would ever have been attained.

The style introduced into ecclesiastical architecture under Constantine, was naturally continued by his immediate successors in the Empire. But after their connexion with Italy had been weakened or rather broken by the Gothic dominion, new modifications took place, which deserve a greater attention than they generally receive. Before, however, leaving that earlier period, we must notice some important matters relating to our subject, which greatly influenced the forms of churches, especially at a later period. Long before the time of Constantine, the Christians had places of worship, and it was not to be expected that, in their prosperity, they would easily forget the humble oratories wherein they had sighed and prayed in the days of their distress. Even then they had adorned them to the best of their power with sculpture and painting; and not so content, had shaped out some of their subterranean chapels in the catacombs, with some pretensions to architectural proportions and decorations. This was always done over or near the tomb of some more distinguished martyr. Now these early practices had necessarily an influence upon their architectural ideas at a later period. In the first place, they led to the erection of oratories or "*memoriae*" over the tombs of martyrs, with a profusion that exceeds belief. The two sisters, SS. Praxedes and Pudentiana, have a large

church each at Rome close to one another ; the two churches of SS. Nereus and Achilleus, and St. Cesarius, near the ancient Porta Capena, almost touch one another, and are miniature basilicas. One side of the Forum is completely made up of churches standing side by side. But besides these, they built smaller chapels, comparatively unadorned. It is not many years since such a one was discovered in excavating the ruins of Nero's Golden House, or the Baths of Titus. It consists of a plain brick oblong edifice, without aisles or pillars ; at the upper end was a plain square stone altar, and over it, painted on the wall, St. Felicitas and her seven sons, with their names inscribed. On the wall on the right hand was Daniel and another prophet, and a calendar showing the days of the week and of the month. These paintings are now nearly effaced, having been left exposed to the weather, till this early and interesting monument was covered in, last year. These small oratories and multiplied churches could not have been intended for parochial instruction, or large meetings of the faithful, but to satisfy particular devotion. They were the means of transferring to above ground, and to the light of day, the special worship or respect paid before to the martyrs' tombs in the catacombs ; and, in fact, not only were many of them built over the entrances to these venerable cemeteries, but they were furnished with a subterranean chapel, imitating their vaulted recesses wherein more distinguished tombs were placed.*

This practice of having oratories or smaller churches, to which the Christians might go according to their peculiar feelings of devotion, and in which the Eucharist was administered, as is evident from their altar, is essentially Catholic, and could not possibly be brought into accordance with Protestant belief or feelings. We can conceive no rational basis for it in their doctrines, and it certainly has no analogy in their usages. But we mention it here because a very slight modification of it produced the Catholic practice of having many chapels or subordinate oratories attached to the larger churches. In fact, the *confession*, or subterranean chapel, is a first example. The earliest instance, perhaps, of several churches grouped together, is that of the Holy Cross, built by Constantine, at Jerusalem, which, though often restored, has preserved its original ground-plan. It consists of separate chapels covering the various stages of our Saviour's passion on Calvary and Olivet, and communicating together through a common body. The Sessorian basilica, (Sta.

* Sepulchral chapels were even built in imitation of subterranean ones. See Agincourt, Pl. xv.

Croce in Gerusalemme) built by his mother, had likewise a chapel annexed, with earth from the Holy Land under its pavement. In later times, we have a remarkable example in the seven churches, now reduced to six, which are clustered together at Bologna under the name of St. Stephen's, and communicate internally together. The same may be said of the church of St. Lawrence near Rome, which is composed of two distinct churches, with a common altar between them.

Secondly, another custom religiously transferred from the catacombs to the basilicas, was that of allowing no altars save such as were martyrs' tombs. Inscriptions sometimes give the title of *ara*, or altar, to a heathen sarcophagus; the two names might be considered more truly synonymous, when applied in the Christian Church. Every altar in the catacombs is in truth a monument to some sacred hero; hence to this day the relics of some martyrs must be deposited in what is called the *sepulchrum* of every Catholic altar, at its consecration; and the centre of the altar must, in every case, be of stone. Hence in the older basilicas, and in many modern churches, the great altar is almost always in the form of a sarcophagus or sepulchral urn, and generally contains the ashes of some ancient martyr.

But this important imitation of the humble chapels of the catacombs in the splendid basilicas of ancient Christianity, was carried even farther. In the cemetery of St. Hermes, situated without the Salarian gate of Rome, is a sarcophagus, adorned with basso-relievos, which has undoubtedly served as an altar. It is fixed, like many other such tombs, in a niche in the wall; so that its front is level with this, while a recess surmounted by an arch is sunk above it, to its own breadth. A species of apsis is thus formed over the altar, which seems to present the type of decoration ever after followed. Round the niche on the outside, is painted Our Saviour with his apostles. Within it he seems to be again represented, and below him his lambs are drinking. This is precisely what will be found represented in mosaic in the arch or apsis of the most ancient churches. But below the lambs, which represent the Church on earth, are half-figures emerging from flames, which Agincourt considers as representing the three children in the fiery furnace. But there are *four* figures in the painting; and therefore, as we do not wish to involve ourselves in controversy by asserting them to exhibit the third state of Christ's Church, the suffering in another world, we will, for the present, suppose them symbolical of the times of persecution. This part of the decoration is the only one not found in the apsis of later churches.

Having thus briefly noticed the modifications which customs

anterior to the triumph of Christianity, produced in the architectural models adopted from the heathens, we proceed to trace the greater variations which time introduced into the form given to the early churches. Theodoric, worthy of bearing the Roman name, has left us several specimens of his magnificence, in his palaces, his churches, and his tomb; and we discover in all that he built, for God or himself, the influence of his aphorism, "Prima fronte talis dominus esse creditur, quale esse habitaculum comprobatur." On the whole, the churches built under him, and by his immediate successors, did not materially differ in form from those of the earlier emperors. We must, however, notice the growing prevalence of circular and polygonar churches, the models for which, as well as the architects, came probably from the east. Under the Lombard domination, from the middle of the sixth to the close of the eighth century, the first decided step took place towards the formation of more modern systems. The few churches yet remaining, said to have been erected at this era, present, in fact, an approximation to what is commonly called Gothic architecture, excepting the pointed arch, which cannot fail to strike an attentive eye. Let us take as an example the church of St. Michael at Pavia, capital of the Lombard kingdom. The leading purpose to which all other innovations may be traced, seems to be the desire of widening the arches, and thus diminishing their number. Pillars were, therefore, out of the question for their support, and consequently buttresses were introduced. Secondly, instead of having these plain, they are formed of many pillars grouped together, whereof those in front, in some instances, run up, above the cornice and the gallery above it, to the very ceiling, and pass as a band or species of groining under it to the other side; in other cases, they are divided by a capital at the cornice, and thus present two orders of pillars one above the other. The remaining columns of each cluster end at the impost of the arch, having there a sculptured capital that follows all their salient angles. Thirdly, above these arches which separate the nave from the aisles, and are of the height of the latter, there runs another series of arches, forming a triforium or gallery, such as prevails in churches of the pointed style. Fourthly, instead of a simple semicircular apsis behind the transept, such as closes the more ancient churches, we have a prolonged sanctuary or choir, ending in a semicircle, but equal to one third of the entire church in length. Fifthly, at the intersection of the cross, we have an octagonal lantern, lighted by two rows of windows. Sixthly, the windows are often composed of two or even three arched windows, joined close together, and separated from one another

by a single pillar. Seventhly, the exterior walls are supported by buttresses, which at the front are formed by clustered pillars, running to the top of the building. The doorways are arched, and composed of six or seven carved bands, receding inwards, after the manner practised in pointed architecture. In fine, to omit many other striking particulars, the entire building, exterior and interior, presents many points of resemblance to that system, in the spurious form, under which, at a later period, it was admitted into middle and southern Italy. If we simply modify the shape of the arch, we should have a perfect resemblance. Every feature which we have pointed out in this church will be found in others of the same period.

We must not, however, conceal from our readers, that Rumohr, to whose acknowledged learning, taste, and sagacity, in all that relates to Italian art, we pay all deference, considers this building, and others usually attributed to the Lombards, as having undergone material alterations in the eleventh or twelfth century.* Milliou and other writers have, no less than Agincourt, considered them as of the epoch we have assigned to this church. Rumohr, however, especially instances the buttresses in front, as yet presenting traces of having been subsequently added. The vaulted ceiling he likewise considers a later addition. Still it does not appear proved that the main features of the building are so modern. Nor if we admit the whole of Rumohr's opinion, will our reasoning be much disturbed. For if we place this church, as it now appears, in the eleventh or early in the twelfth century, it will be still older than the appearance of pointed architecture in England, and contemporary at least with the ruder system which led to its invention.

It is in either case difficult to deny, that in these churches we have a germ of that architecture which our ancestors first brought over from Italy. The communication between them and Lombardy was very frequent: and if the architecture of our earliest churches seems to indicate that Rome was the country from which it was borrowed, we can hardly conceive this intermediate character between the older basilical and the later pointed styles, to have exercised no action, as an element in the gradual transition from one to the other.

But if we find it reasonable to suppose, that this Lombard was the rude model of our own splendid ecclesiastical architecture, it certainly prepared the way and established principles for the restoration of the classical orders, as applied at the revival of art. The *great* Charlemagne (the epithet has so become a

* *Italienische Forschungen*, Berlin, 1831. 3 Th. S. 173.

part of his name that it is hardly superfluous where thus repeated) did, it is true, lead architecture some steps back towards a return to the more ancient rules. The church of the Holy Apostles, built by him at Florence, is a perfect basilica, without a transept, or a choir, but with the ancient semicircular apsis. Its aisles are separated from the nave by pillars supporting arches, and the proportions of the building are admirable; its length being exactly twice its width. Here, then, we have a proof of what we before described, the natural tendency of Italian architects, in every attempt at improvement, to go back to earlier models rather than to modify that which they possessed. The age of Charlemagne was decidedly one of great general improvement; and accordingly we find that, instead of farther departure from ancient types, by any new development of the Lombard style, it returned at once to the era of Constantine. But there is a spell upon the direction of social life, which will frustrate the completeness of any attempt to go back over its own once imprinted footsteps. In spite of this change, one great feature of the Lombard architecture was still preserved; the very wide span of the arch. For instance, in the very church of which we have just spoken, there are on each side *seven* intercolumniations, in a length of about *seventy four* (Parisian) feet; whereas in the basilica of St. Paul there were, and now again are, *twenty-one* intercolumniations, in a length of *one hundred and forty-one* feet, that is, *three* times as many in about *twice* the space. In the church of Sto. Spirito, built also by Charlemagne, at Rome, we have *eight* arcades, in a length of *one hundred and twenty* feet. In this amended style, we recognize another groundwork of modern Italian architecture; but before proceeding with our remarks upon it, we must say a few words concerning the partial introduction of the pointed architecture into Italy.

It is impossible to study the specimens of this style which appeared in central Italy, without acquiring a conviction that, in every instance, it had to struggle against the impressions made by the Roman system, and that the struggle was too unequal for it ever completely to succeed. Into Sicily, where the public taste was partly prepared for it by the prevalence of Arabic monuments, it was easily introduced: but this was effected by the dominion there of Norman princes, who naturally followed what they had been accustomed to in their own country. The church of Monreale, near Palermo, the burial-place of their family, was perhaps their earliest and noblest monument. Yet, even here, the influence of the basilical style is manifest. Rome does not present one single specimen of

even tolerable pointed architecture,—certainly, at least, not beyond an occasional tomb or tabernacle. This might, perhaps, be attributed to the absence of the Popes at Avignon, during the period when it would most probably have been employed. We should rather assign the reason already given, of the counter-acting influence exercised by a previously existing style. The church of St. Flavian, near Monte-Fiascone, was erected about the middle of the thirteenth century, by Urban IV, a *Frenchman*, but is in a barbarous style, which deserves to be called neither Gothic nor Roman, for the two are frightfully jumbled together. Yet this in England was the golden era, which saw York, Salisbury, and Westminster erected. A century later, under another French Pope, the Church of Sta. Maria sopra la Minerva, was built in Rome, and presents another specimen of coarse bastard Gothic. But we may perhaps be asked, have we forgotten the splendid fronts of the cathedrals of Siena and Orvieto? By no means: for they present a strong confirmation of our theory, that the introduction of pointed architecture was irresistibly thwarted in Italy by the tendency to revive older systems. The two fronts are nearly of the same design, and both are gorgeously rich in execution. But neither presents the characteristics of pure and perfect pointed architecture. The horizontal lines strongly prevail over the perpendicular; the pediments, with their decided cornices below them, approach to Roman architecture; most of the arches are circular; the square is the prevailing figure in the centre; there are no towers, and the buttresses shooting up from the basement to the pinnacles which they bear, of equal breadth, and unbroken by a single ornament characteristic of the northern style, look rather like pilasters than anything else. Then, the moment you enter either church, all illusion vanishes; the arches are circular, the columns that support them Doric, and, excepting in the windows, little will be met to remind one of any of our cathedrals. What we have said of the fronts of these two churches applies with greater force to that of San Petronio at Bologna, designed by Terribilia.

About the time when pointed architecture might have been expected to enter Italy, that is, about the very time when these churches were erected, a revolution occurred in the sister arts, which, in our judgment, was fatal to its complete introduction. Paradox as it may appear, we allude to the revival of sculpture and painting. The Pisani, who adorned, by their marvellous carvings, the churches of Siena and Orvieto, and thus made the first gigantic step in the restoration of sculpture, wrought upon them with an eye ever turned towards the remains of classical

antiquity. Every line in their works attests this fact, were history silent: but this has recorded the very basso-relievo, a trophy of Pisan victories in Greece, from which Niccolo di Pisa caught his first inspiration. It was impossible for such an admiration and such a study of the antique, in sculpture, not to check any rising partiality towards the pointed style. For such a new direction given to taste would necessarily extend, first to the details, and from them to the greater members, of ancient architecture. In fact, whoever examines, by way of example, the beautiful representation of the *General Resurrection*, carved upon what Vasari rightly considers the master-piece of the Pisan school, the front of Orvieto Cathedral, will observe how the dead are made to rise, not from the ground, but from antique sarcophagi, the forms and decorations of which are strictly copied from classical models, and totally at variance with the style usual in the pointed manner.* To speak the truth, we should feel inclined to blame this school for having at once run into heathenism of style, by abandoning the Christian types for the classical, without allowing their art the privilege which painting enjoyed for some centuries, of being conducted upon religious principles.

But how did *this* more strictly Christian art impede the progress of an architecture, itself eminently Christian? To answer this question, we must observe that sculpture, rather than painting, is the hand-maid, or decorative attendant on pointed architecture. The basilical style presented extensive plain surfaces, within and above the apsis, round the triumphal arch, and especially over the entablature of the nave. From the earliest times these were all covered with painting, generally in its most durable, and consequently its most catholic, form—mosaic. The pointed architecture, on the contrary, abhors plain surfaces, but seeks to break every part with sculptured decorations. The ceiling, one great field of church painting, is cut up into small compartments by the groinings; the space above the arches in the nave is occupied by the triforium, and the space corresponding to them on the outer wall, as well as above the gallery, is taken up by the windows, the leading features of this architecture. It was certainly a magnificent inspiration of art that suggested the idea of employing painting, where alone it interfered not with the principles of the style, and where heathen art would have treated the project as chimerical, upon the frail glass, which seemed the substance least suited to receive it. And yet time has proved the contrary to

* See this representation engraved in Cicognara's *Storia della Scultura*, pl. xvii.

be true. However, glass was not adapted for great compositions; nor was the process of staining it equal to answering the demands of the reviving art. At the same time that the pointed style was able to penetrate into Italy, the first dawning of a brilliant era for painting was appearing. Cimabue, Giotto, Gaddi, and other patriarchs of the art, broke through the enslaving principles of the Greek school, and, feeling that the variety and richness of their art were as great as those of nature, demanded space proportioned to their conceptions of its grandeur, and sufficient for the display of its wealthy stores. Religion, ever the first to encourage every new effort of genius, and to engage it in the service of God, could not refuse so just a request. The Campo Santo at Pisa presents, indeed, a Gothic cloister; for its inner-windows and decorations are in the pointed style; but its immense range of wall, instead of being encrusted with arches, or other ornamental stone-work, was left smooth, and given up to the pencil of every artist of sufficient celebrity to be admitted to the honour of working there. The double church of Assisium, (there being one above the other,) was likewise pointed, but of the plainest kind. Immense surfaces were left, appropriated in the same manner as at Pisa, the field of excellence on which the first geniuses of the reviving pictorial art loved to exhibit their rival powers. This new love for coloured rather than sculptured decorations and representations, could not but act with hostility to the introduction of pointed architecture, such as it was then becoming in the north of Europe.

A few dates will be of service towards illustrating this matter. About the year 1200, Lincoln Cathedral was built; in 1221, Guido di Siena painted the first picture which broke through the stiff Greek method, and fixes the era of the revival of painting. In 1225, Niccolo di Pisa completed his grand sculpture on the shrine of St. Dominic at Bologna.

About 1250, Salisbury, Worcester, and Notre Dame at Paris, were built, or greatly altered. In 1240 Cimabue, in 1276 Giotto, was born; and, before the close of the century, both had begun to cover the walls of churches with frescoes, objects of universal admiration. In 1290, the cathedral of Orvieto was commenced, and eight years later that of Florence.

But the next century brought our northern style to its perfection. Its first half saw the naves of York and Westminster finished, as well as several splendid foreign cathedrals. It was only after thus brought to perfection in the north, that we could expect more southern nations to have received it, in such form as to justify comparison between the two parts of Europe.—

Accordingly, we find Portugal adopting it, by employing an Irish architect to build the splendid abbey of Batalha in 1388; and the Visconti, in northern Italy, commenced the cathedral of Milan in 1386, the very time that the groinings of Exeter were finished (1370), and Canterbury was rebuilt (1381). Now, just at that very moment, Brunelleschi was born (1377), the restorer of the basilical style, as modified under Charlemagne, and the founder of the classical manner, as used chiefly in the *cinquecento*.

During the fifteenth century, the pointed architecture continued its development in England, so as to produce the third, or richest order; Windsor Chapel being built in 1450, and Henry VIIIth's Chapel half a century later; while the tower of Strasburg was erected in 1449. In the meantime, every hope of its adoption in Italy was utterly crushed, not only by the admiration excited by Brunelleschi's designs, but by the theoretical as well as practical works of Leone Battista Alberti. The writings of Vitruvius had now been recovered, the rules of ancient art were accurately studied, and the admiration of antiquity embraced its artistic as much as its literary peculiarities. Before the last mentioned chapel had been finished, Bramante was on the stage; and the idea of rebuilding St. Peter's had been probably entertained.

From this comparative view it is sufficiently manifest, that while the pointed architecture was successively improving in the north,—and we feel justified in considering our own country as the great school wherein it was perfected,—feelings and principles were rising and taking root in Italy, highly unfavourable to its adoption there, and that these increased in force just in proportion as that advanced in beauty. No blame can attach to either side: each followed a natural course of art, imposed upon them by their historical career, by their state of social and political existence, by the genius of their races in the human family, by climate, and other irresistible and uncontrollable agents. If we be inclined to blame or pity Italy for not having caught, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the grand spirit which superintended the erection of our minsters, she retorts by wondering, how, during the same centuries, she should have been covering the walls of churches, of porticoes, of cemeteries, and of palaces, with paintings of imperishable fame,—how comparatively petty cities should have formed schools of art, each in its own character eminent,—and that yet not a spark from this blaze of glory should have reached our northern shores; and that those ages should not, in France or England, have produced a single school, a single

artist, a single painting, worthy of commemoration. Let each country, then, be content with its own glory, and neither revile nor repine at the other's. Let each boast of having nobly followed the impulses of events, and, starting from a common point, of having reached goals different indeed, but each worthy of being accounted a noble prize. A few more words will close our sketch of Italian architecture.

We mentioned, a couple of paragraphs back, two eminent architects, contemporaries and friends, Brunelleschi and Alberti. The first of these attracted attention by a well-known portico at Florence, in which very wide arches spring from light and elegant columns. This was the death-blow of the pointed architecture in that city. Its architect attained the great point of his ambitious aims, the termination of the Florentine cathedral, the cupola of which had been left unfinished for nearly one hundred years. This he brought to a most happy conclusion; and though he sacrificed something to the semi-pointed character of the building, he here gave the great model to the unparalleled dome which crowns St. Peter's. It was, however, by the two churches of San Lorenzo and Sto. Spirito, that Brunelleschi made himself the head of the new school. In these, the arches of the nave rest upon columns, and the intercolumniations are sufficiently wide to form entrances into lateral chapels. It evidently was the convenience which this system presented for this purpose, that led, at least in part, to its adoption. The basilica of the twelve apostles, erected by Charlemagne, served, as has been already remarked, for a model to Brunelleschi. When it was built it had no side chapels; but, in course of time, these had been added, so as to correspond on each side to the openings of the arcade. It is not easy, perhaps, to decide, when this plan of flanking the church with chapels was introduced. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, if we remember rightly, informs us that St. Hilarus, successor to the Great St. Leo, added four oratories to the Baptistery of Constantine, dedicated to the Holy Cross, and to SS. John Baptist, John the Evangelist, and Stephen, probably the same which still remain. We have already seen how the ancient Christians erected detached chapels to different saints, and how they united several churches together. It was natural enough, as the number increased of those to whom veneration and worship was to be shown, to unite the *memories* or chapels in this manner, so as to open into a common church, the high altar of which should be reserved for more solemn worship. This laudable practice, once introduced, necessarily modified the form of the church, and gained a preference for that adaptation of the classical architecture, which allowed the

side chapels to appear connected with the church, by being visible from its middle or principal part. This could not be the case when the columns were kept close, as the ancient architectural proportions required. It would have been unreasonably presumptuous in an architect to decline from those forms which the discipline of the Church that employed him rendered necessary for its worship; or to expect its established usages to bend to his professional rules. Hence Brunelleschi, among more ancient Christian models, chose that one which experience had already proved best lent itself to the worship of the Church, as modified in the course of ages. The measurements of his parts, however, the forms of his architectural members, and even of his mouldings, were taken from the antique; and thus he combined classical taste with a proper attention to fitness and convenience. He laid the foundation of a style peculiarly prevalent at Florence, and to some extent in Rome, during the sixteenth century; the history of which is so closely connected with that of sculpture, that it must not be enlarged on in this place.

The new style introduced by this great architect, however much admired, was by no means incapable of still farther improvement. It was considered desirable to remove the eye-sore to the classical observer, of columns supporting anything but an entablature; but it was by no means desirable to do this with any sacrifice of the convenience obtained by Brunelleschi's method. L. B. Alberti, in his famous church of St. Andrew, at Mantua, gave the model on which St. Peter's, and almost every other great modern church in Italy, has been constructed. It consists in a nave separated from the sides, whether they are formed of aisles or only of chapels, by means of arches, having their own imposts, with buttresses between them, on which are half-columns or else pilasters, that support an unbroken entablature running over the arches. We do not think it difficult to discover whence Alberti drew this idea: that is, from the ancient amphitheatres, or still more probably from the triumphal arches. In the former, serieses of open arches have an entablature that runs round the entire building, supported by half columns placed against every buttress. In the triumphal arches, there are either half columns, as in that of Titus, or detached pillars, as in that of Septimius Severus. Now it is evident that Alberti, when called to finish the superb church begun by the Malatestas, at Rimini, chose, as the model for its front, the triumphal arch still existing in that city. From his church at Mantua, we may date the commencement of the style ever since prevailing in Italy, but which reached its perfection in the wonderful Vatican basilica. And if Brunelleschi copied the reformed architecture introduced by

Charlemagne, Alberti may be said to have restored, with incalculable improvements, the forms employed by the Lombard school. Michelangiolo, the greatest of his followers, however indebted to antiquity, and however partial to its unrivalled monuments, had too much genius to follow their system blindly, without fitting things to their real purposes. Both in sculpture and in architecture he took care, without ever losing sight of antiquity, to be original and modern. No one ever felt as he did the superior dignity of Christian over pagan art; and the necessity of satisfying, by the former, wants and aspirations which the latter could never feel.

Here we may close our sketchy history of sacred architecture in Italy; from which it will appear that it has its links so closely woven together, that, without a breach of continuity, a *fault*, as geologists call it, in the natural course of social progress, no other system could have been introduced; so that the great churches of modern times are the legitimate and undegenerated descendants of the earliest Christian edifices. In all this we have no doubt but we possess Mr. Pugin's suffrage; for his favourite architecture would well deserve to be styled *Gothic*, if it suggested the overthrow of every other system, however venerable, and however adapted to times and places. *A propos* of this name,—which Rumohr, with no small degree of plausibility, attributes to Vasari,* who actually confounds the *Gothic* architecture under Theodoric, with the pointed style,—we must observe, that while we agree in banishing the vulgar name, given in ignorance and continued in derision, we feel the want of a substitute for it. The term *pointed architecture*, now usually prefixed, is far from satisfactory; for it will not apply, as an epithet, to the parts of architecture. We can say a *Grecian* column, base, or capital; but we should feel it awkward to speak of a *pointed* pillar, or a *pointed* cornice. Might not the term *Northern*, as giving locality to the origin and prevalence of the style, be well adapted to distinguish the system from those which we usually designate by their countries, as Roman, Grecian, Egyptian, or Etruscan?

So far are we from considering Mr. Pugin as harsh or severe upon Protestant art (if there be such a thing) in England, that we think he might have added much to his censure. For instance, if the extinction of all good pointed architecture amongst us be clearly imputable to the change of religion, the accusation will have double weight if we look at the abominations erected as tombs, under Elizabeth and James I, in Westminster Abbey and

* Page 169.

elsewhere, and intended for Grecian architecture, with sculpture that would have disgraced the most barbarous period of the middle ages; and consider that these arts were in their perfection in other parts of Europe. But the religion adopted by England was not only, in its nature, hostile to their progress, but proved an effectual bar to their introduction by foreign artists. For while it was a matter of drawing, hanging, and quartering, to deny the king's supremacy, or to worship the saints, there was not much chance of Italian artists, who received liberal encouragement in France and Spain, crossing the seas to teach or practise the arts, at the risk of either their faith or their necks. We are not, indeed, acquainted with a single great inspiration of the sublime or the beautiful in art, for which the world is indebted to Protestantism. Even St. Paul's, avowed copy as it is, betrays its incapacity to conceive a great original thought. The system of arches separating the nave from the aisles was retained, as we have seen, from the necessity or propriety of giving entrance to lateral chapels; in St. Paul's there are no chapels, and the rules of classical architecture have been departed from, without a plea of fitness to excuse it. The dome in St. Peter's is raised over the high altar; it is a sublime canopy to that great concentrating object; it raises the eyes and thoughts to heaven, when kneeling beneath it: what meaning has that of the London cathedral? It is situated out of the precincts devoted to worship, it overshadows nothing holier than the statues of Dr. Johnson and Mr. Howard, perhaps the tomb of its architect*; and we believe it more celebrated from containing a whispering gallery, which may be visited for a shilling, than from any religious impression that it makes!

One concluding word of advice to Catholics. Let them profit by Mr. Pugin's book. Let them ever remember that good taste is a prerogative of their religion, that the arts are its handmaids, and that they will have to make a reckoning with posterity. We cannot be expected to compete with our forefathers in splendour of dimension or of decoration; but we may imitate them in good taste. Let no individual follow his own caprices in buildings consecrated to God, and belonging to his religion.

* St. Peter's is the tomb of the apostles: an inscription in St. Paul's tells us that it is the tomb of Sir C. Wren! This inscription, which occupies the most prominent situation in the church, is often instanced as bordering upon sublimity: to us it is at least profane, and in miserable taste. Of the greatest ancient Christian works the architect is unknown: neither Bramante nor Michelangiolo has left his name recorded anywhere in St. Peter's; wherever any such records appear in ancient churches, as at Pisa, they are either outside the church, or placed on the cornice, or some other place where they can least attract notice.

Let us have nothing that can be mistaken for a dissenter's meeting-house on one side, nor for a profane building on the other; but let all our churches be so constructed, that no Catholic may pass them without an act of reverence, and no Protestant without a look of admiration.

ART. V.—*Histoire de Sainte Elizabeth de Hongrie, Duchesse de Thuringe*. (1207-1231.) Par Le Comte de Montalembert, Pair de France. Paris. 1836.

IN perusing the various works which come under our hand, in our duty as reviewers, our feelings must vary according to their character. We speak not at present of such as stir up indignant and unpleasant emotions: the volume before us banishes the thought of all such from our minds. But, in turning over pages of more agreeable nature, sometimes we may be astonished at the erudition displayed by the writer—sometimes we may rather admire his sagacity and genius; some books may convey to us a high opinion of his moral qualities, and others make us long for his acquaintance as a man of amiable and virtuous character. Seldom, however, has it been our lot to experience the peculiar feelings which have accompanied the perusal of the work now on our table: feelings more akin to jealousy than to any other we have described. It was not the research, nor the rich poetical genius, nor the deep religious tone, nor the eloquent language of its youthful author, conspicuous and admirable as all these qualities are, which rivetted our attention, or secured our sympathy,—it was the sincere love, the enthusiastic devotion, with which his task has been undertaken and accomplished, that has made us, so to speak, envy him the days and the years which he has spent upon its performance. So pure must have been the heart and soul while occupied with the sainted object of their spiritual affections; so closed must the feelings have been against the rude materialities of life in this sear generation, while inhaling the healthy freshness of a greener age; so full of delicious meditation, of varied hope, and of conscious success, must his pilgrimage have been, as he strayed from town to town, in thoughtful simple-hearted Germany, to cull traditions yet living in the memories of the people, or discover mouldy records in its libraries; in fine, so full of content and peace must life have seemed, while thus passed, in spite of many a trial which needed strong consolation, that gladly would we exchange

many of our barren years for but a few so joyfully and yet so usefully spent.

But we are forgetting, that as yet we have presented neither our author nor his book to the reader, beyond the mere ceremony of announcing their names at the head of our article; and we have been writing as though we believed him possessed of the same happiness as ourselves, of personal acquaintance with both. The best account we can give of the writer, will be our notice of his work; for his character is imprinted on every page. A few brief preliminaries will therefore suffice. The Count de Montalembert is not a visionary, who has centred his studies and meditations upon by-gone ages, to the neglect of duties required by the present. As a peer of France he has been found at his post, once indeed, in earlier days, at its bar, to plead the rights of Christian education against the barbarous monopoly of a semi-infidel university; and since, in his place, to unite the applause of all parties at his noble and eloquent vindication of ecclesiastical rights, outraged in the person of the Archbishop of Paris. Versed, and even fluent, in almost every language of civilized Europe; connected with our own country as well as with France by ties of blood; with Belgium by more recent domestic bonds; with Italy and Germany by repeated visits, during which he has imbibed from the one the spirit of Christian art, from the other that of Christian philosophy; with Poland by an enthusiastic admiration of its struggle for liberty against its tyrant, as well as a rare acquaintance with its literature; he is not as one asleep, nor as one walking in dreams amidst his generation, but is as able to understand its wants and their remedies, as any who will perhaps consider that time lost for public purposes, which is not spent in planning rail-roads, or discussing the budget. In England, it will be probably imagined by many, that a peer who could think of writing a saint's life must be a bigot and a Bourbonist, to say no worse. Now M. De Montalembert is neither: he attaches not the happiness of his country to the augury of a name; he advocates the cause of rational liberty under the government that actually exists;—because he considers true liberty as based upon a religious, a Catholic principle, which should predominate under every form of government, and is the unalienable right of every Christian people. But let him speak for himself, at the conclusion of his beautiful introduction, of which we shall say no more just now.

“It would give us pain, were it to be thought, in consequence of what we have said, that we are blind enthusiasts for the middle ages, that we consider them in every respect admirable, enviable, and blame-

less, and fancy that, in the age wherein we live, the nations may not be healed as heretofore.* Far from us the wish to pine away in useless regret, and to wear out our eyes, weeping over the tomb of nations whose inheritors we are. Far from us the vain thought of bringing back times which have for ever fled. We know that the Son of God died upon the cross to save mankind, not during five or six centuries, but for the world's entire duration. . . . We regret not, therefore, however we may admire, any human institutions which have flourished, according to the lot of every thing that is human; but we bitterly regret, the soul, the divine spirit, which animated them, and which is no longer to be found in the institutions that have replaced them. It is not then a barren contemplation of the past, it is not a contempt nor a cowardly abandonment of the present, that we recommend: once more we say, away from us such miserable thoughts. But as the exile, banished from his hearth for his fidelity to the laws of heaven, will often direct his affectionate thoughts towards those who have loved him, and who await him in his native land; as the soldier, fighting upon distant shores, is warmed by the account of battles which his forefathers have there gained; so be it allowed to us, whom our faith makes us in some sort exiles in the midst of modern society, to raise our hearts and our looks towards the blessed inhabitants of our celestial fatherland, and, humble soldiers in the cause which hath glorified them, to inflame our hearts with the recital of their combats and their victories."—p. cx. * * *

"Such are the thoughts which have inspired us while writing the life of Elizabeth of Hungary, who loved much and suffered much, but in whom religion purified every affection, and comforted every grief. To our brethren in the faith we present this book, alien, both by its subject and its form, from the spirit of 'the times in which we live.' But the simplicity, the humility, and the charity, whereof we would recount the marvels, are, like the God that inspires them, above all claims of time or place. May this our labour only bear into some souls, simple or sorrowing, a reflection of those sweet emotions which we, in writing it, have experienced; may it rise towards the throne of God, as a weak and timid spark from that ancient Catholic flame which is not yet extinguished in all hearts."—p. cxv.

These extracts will serve more than all we can say, towards disabusing any of our readers of a preventive surmise, that the author of such a work as this must be a mere dreamer, who steals from active life into the seclusion of his study, or affects a blind partiality for systems of no practical utility. And here let us indulge in a remark, that will appear almost profane in such a place, that there is more visionary inutility in the modern schemes of *industriel* materialism, in the plans for civilizing and bettering the condition of men in their lowest scale, according to the views of the age, than in all the desires of good and

* *Sanabiles fecit omnes nationes terræ*, sap. i. 14.

learned men to rekindle enthusiasm for the spirit of the middle ages, and even to revive its usages. The Lanark nonsense, and the Saint-Simonian madness, which pretend to improve mankind by the fuller working out of the utilitarian principles now in vogue, are more dreams than any of these, and, what is worse, are only *ægri somnia*, the delirious ravings of sickly phantasies, and disordered brains. But to return.

We owe the present work to one of those happy combinations of circumstances, which convince the individual that is their subject, of a benevolent Providence watching over his good. Our author arrived at Marburg one 19th of November, and proceeded to examine its church, the first in which the pure pointed architecture was adopted in Germany. Though now in Lutheran hands, it was open on this day, but its only occupants were some children who played among its tombs. Such were the marks of honour that distinguished the festival of its patron saint, Elizabeth! He saw her mutilated statue upon one of the pillars of the church; he diligently studied the rich traces of early painting and carving upon its desecrated altars, representing the principal events of her life; he visited the silver shrine, now neglected in the sacristy, wherein her sacred ashes reposed, till the sacrilegious barbarity of the Reformation, in the person of one of her own descendants, tore them thence, and scattered them to the winds. Around it, he observed the stones worn hollow by the knees of pilgrims; and, having kissed these monuments of ancient piety, he resumed his thoughtful way. The image of "the dear *St. Elizabeth*," as she has ever been called in Germany by the people and by her biographers, and as throughout his work he has loved to call her, hovered as a sweet vision round him on his journey; he sought for records of her life, among the living as among the dead; he went as a palmer from place to place, which heretofore she had glorified by her virtues in life, and sought in the collections of ancient documents all that her age had left on record concerning her virtues. The result of his researches occupy this volume.

Few distinguished persons of any age have found more numerous or more affectionate biographers than *St. Elizabeth of Hungary*. The list of authorities quoted by *De Montalembert*, consists of thirty-eight printed, and fourteen manuscript works.* Yet, many known to have once existed, have been mislaid or destroyed. Of the writings thus enumerated, a considerable proportion were by contemporaries of our saint; some contain

* One of these, the MS. collection prepared by the Bollandists, contained itself fourteen different documents.

the juridical depositions of her individual and inseparable companions. Of the later authors, a considerable proportion are Protestants. From the two sermons of Happel, a Lutheran curate (1645), entitled "*Diva Elisabetha magnifice coronata*," to the third volume of Von Raumer's great historical work on the house of Hohenstaufen, religious prejudice has not been permitted to alloy the pure enthusiastic affection which the name of Elizabeth has ever excited through all Germany. But her new biographer would not content himself with the study of these sources; he naturally felt how necessary and how interesting it was, for a proper appreciation of her character, to view her in connexion with the age in which she lived, and of whose spirit she so powerfully partook. For this purpose, he ranged through the history, the literature, and arts of her age; and, anxious that his readers should see the admirable qualities of his heroine through the same medium, he has judiciously prefixed to her life, in the form of an introduction, a summary review of the period in which she flourished. This part of the work, we must, at the risk of great injustice to its merits, present compendiously to the reader's notice.

From the title of the work, it will be seen that the period occupied by its history, is a brief portion of the first half of the thirteenth century (1207-1231); a period of time, to the general conception of history-readers, wrapped up in the veil of darkness, usually known under the name of "the middle ages," associated in their minds with some vague ideas about ignorance and superstition, both of which, if they have any connexion with the period, find it only in their proper seat, such a reader's own mind. For, in truth, the thirteenth century is one of the most important, and most interesting in the annals of Christian Europe.

The latter portion of the preceding century had greatly belied the promises of its commencement; the influence of St. Bernard and the immortal Hildebrand, had well-nigh been neutralized by the triumphs which brute force had subsequently gained over the spiritual power of religion, justice, and genius, in Europe and in Palestine. But just at the close of the ill-omened century, the chair of Peter became occupied by one whose soul, talents, and energy, were equal to the crisis, and turned the infant energies of a new era to the purposes of good. Innocent III must not be as slightly touched on as our present theme would alone justify; his full and just biography by Hurter, a Protestant clergyman, will claim our future and detailed attention. Suffice it here to say, that not one great or good quality seems to have been wanting to make up his character. As a

poet, the two unrivalled hymns, *Stabat Mater* and *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, must sufficiently stamp his reputation; as a statesman, his complicated and successful efforts for the welfare of every country in Europe, must ensure his reputation; a man above every temptation of ambition, he is declared by the fact of his bitterest enemies leaving him sole guardian of their infant heirs; as a pontiff, his zeal and success, in restoring several nations to religious unity, attest his worth; while his powerful genius appears most conspicuously in the influence exercised by his principles and actions upon his worthy successors in the Apostolic See.

The civil state was no less distinguished by great and beneficial actions in favour of humanity. The Imperial House did not, indeed, come up to its great destinies; but under its shadow there grew an illustrious scion, the root of a mighty race, that Rodolph of Hapsburg, born in 1218, who, at his coronation, when the sceptre could not be found, took the crucifix from the altar, and holding it aloft, exclaimed:—"Behold my sceptre; I wish for none other." The two great codes of German, and of purely Christian, legislation, the Mirrors of Saxony and Swabia, belong to this period, when the great cities rose into importance, and almost every principality could boast of some great name among its rulers. Of France, it is sufficient to say, that it was governed successively by Philip Augustus, and the greatest of modern kings, St. Louis; of England, that to this period we owe Magna Charta, and our first parliament; of Spain, that it counted among its sovereigns James, the Conqueror of Valentia; Alfonso, founder of the University of Salamanca, the hero of the great day of the "Navas de Tolosa," which broke the Moorish power; and St. Ferdinand the Catholic, the liberator of his country by the conquest of Seville. Every other lesser part of Europe was equally indebted to this epoch for some signal step in its progress towards regeneration.

In the spiritual life, this century was even more remarkable. The foundation of the two great religious orders, of St. Francis and St. Dominic, is enough to give an indelible character of glory to the age. These two patriarchs, of whom Dante writes—

L'un fu tutto serafico in ardore,
L'altro per sapienza in terra fue
Di cherubica luce uno splendore,

*Paradis. XI.**

not only trained up two schools of saints, both among their

* The one was as a seraph in his love,
The other was, in wisdom, upon earth
A brightness caught from cherubs' light above.

rigorous followers, and among their disciples in the world, (of whom St. Elizabeth was one) but discharged a mission of peace and good-will among the hardy nations of Europe; caused poverty, which they sanctified, to be respected; and justice, which they ever advocated, to be dealt to the oppressed. They raised up learned doctors, who left no corner of science unexplored; who, like Vincent of Beauvais, composed entire encyclopædias of human and divine learning; or like Albertus Magnus, and the angelic St. Thomas, confuted every error, and unravelled all the mazes of philosophical doubt; or, like Roger Bacon, fathomed the mysteries of nature, and revealed her hidden laws; or, in fine, like St. Bonaventura, chose the better part of meditating, in most heavenly mood, at the feet of Christ, and of his Blessed Mother.

The portion of introduction which unfolds the spiritual riches of the age of St. Elizabeth, will not bear abridgment; it is itself too rapid a sketch to be farther reduced, and the attempt would, moreover, strip it of that warm colouring, that living glow of enthusiasm, with which it is so richly tinted. Never were so many great examples of virtue and piety, in every rank of life, collected in one period of the Church, as adorn this century; and if our author has selected one as his *cynosure*, by which to direct his course through its historical perplexities, he has left a rich store of others, scarcely less bright, to reward the affectionate researches of any kindred mind.

Of the ardour with which every branch of sacred literature was pursued during this period, we have already cited several instances, and plenty more might be added. Profane learning—if any such could be said to exist in an age when religion guided every pen—had began to rise from its ashes; and the science of legislation, in particular, reached a high degree of perfection in the many codes which date from this period. For the history of art during it, we must refer our readers to another article in this Number,* in which we have, imperfectly enough, spoken somewhat of the glorious cathedrals which northern Europe saw arise during the thirteenth century, and of the impulse which the sister arts of painting and sculpture received in Italy, from the schools of Pisa, Siena, and Florence. This, perhaps, is the honour of the age which is most generally known;—for who has not heard of Cimabue, Giotto, and Niccolo Pisano? But the poetry of that period, at least out of Italy, is but little spoken of. Yet France probably produced more truly poetical performances then, than it has done since. The Count De

* On Mr. Pugin's "Contrasts."

Montalembert very judiciously excludes the Provençal school, which, by its licentiousness, and almost heathenish profaneness, may be said to have received a taint from its proximity to the Manicheism of the Albigenses and other such heretics; but he remarks that among the religious poets—epic, lyrical, elegiac, satirical, and even dramatic, compositions, were in use as much as in the age of Louis XIV.

"Upwards of two hundred poets," he writes, "whose works yet remain, flourished in that century; perhaps the day will come when Catholics will think it worth while to seek in their works some of the most delightful productions of the Christian muse; instead of imagining, with Boileau, that poetry began in France only with Malherbe."—p. lxxv.

To Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, Europe owes its first modern drama, as well as England her Great Charter;—a double glory not easily to be rivalled. The subject of his poem was the Redemption of Man. Germany, however, has been more just than any other country to the reputation of its early bards, who adorned this century. Its *Minnesänger* or troubadours, headed, in genius, by Walther von Vogelweide, have their proper place in its literature; the great epic, the *Nibelungen Lied*, is read by youths at school. But the history of St. Elizabeth is intimately connected with that of German poetry. At the moment of her birth in Hungary, seven of the most celebrated poets of Germany, including the afore-named Walther, and the no less famous Wolfram von Eschenbach, were assembled at the court of her future father-in-law, in the castle of Wartburg, contending for the palm of the "joyous science," in a series of compositions known by the name of the poetic War of Wartburg, (*Der Singerkriec uf Wartburg*) and published by Ettmüller in 1830. Klingsohr, sent for as umpire in the contest, which had defied the judgment of less refined auditors, announced her birth, and foretold that she should marry the heir of the royal house of Thuringia.

Here we might be expected to enter upon the body of our book, having been naturally brought to the birth of its heroine. But for this purpose we should be obliged to pass over upwards of twenty pages, to us the most delightful in the volume. The history of poetry in the thirteenth century—the age of Dante—could not be complete without embracing Italy. But even its first half, of which De Montalembert chiefly treats, before the divine poet was born, was far from barren of successful cultivators of the sacred muse. He himself mentions his great predecessors; but it is a curious fact that the first to whose poems no date can be assigned, is that most wonderful saint of the period—St. Francis of Assisium. We are not surprised to see

our youthful author yielding himself up, on the mention of his name, to the flow of religious enthusiasm, which it must excite in any bosom that contains a heart capable of rightly estimating his superhuman virtues. Our author admirably characterizes that age in a few words, when he tells us, it may be considered as the age of St. Francis and St. Louis. But the influence of the latter was comparatively limited to the country which he governed in righteousness and truth, while that of "the Seraph of Assissium" extended to entire Europe. He was the first man who laid a foundation in modern society for the importance of the people; he made, as we have already remarked, poverty glorious, and a lowly condition enviable; for while, on the one hand, his virtues attracted towards him and his, the veneration of the great,—the daughters of kings, and the noblest knights, were among the first to enrol themselves in his secular institute. As during life he was the regenerator of popular poetry, so after death he became the favourite theme of art, and his tomb was its earliest sanctuary. The wonderful union in him of childlike simplicity and noblest sentiment, of a sympathetic affection for nature and all it contains, and the highest soarings after heavenly things that man was ever admitted to since the apostolic age, forms a character wherein all the perfections of the earlier Church seem to have mingled with the germs of the new state into which society had entered, giving them a moral energy, they never else so powerfully possessed.

It will not then seem wonderful that St. Elizabeth, though living in Germany, should have felt the influence of his character,—should have joined her age in its universal admiration of his privileged holiness, and should have been the first to introduce his order into her own country. Many points of resemblance may easily be traced between the characters of both; but there is one on which many may be tempted to doubt our prudence if we speak much. It is not the simplicity of heart, for which both were equally remarkable, nor their absolute love of poverty, nor any other such rare virtue, to which we allude: but to the wonderful or miraculous events which all contemporary historians have described in their lives. Upon this matter we think it better to introduce M. De Montalembert's own words, because they record the convictions of one who has deeply studied the monuments of that age, and who, not being anonymous as we are, cannot excite the unjust suspicion that he would not have courage openly to avow his sentiments. Thus he writes towards the close of his Introduction.

"We are aware, that to put forth such a biography as this, in its complete form, we must be prepared to meet with a class of facts and

of ideas, which the unsettled religions of modern times have long since marked with reprobation, and which a sincere but timid piety has too often excluded from religious history; we allude to those supernatural phenomena which are so frequent in the lives of the saints, which faith has consecrated by the name of miracles, and worldly wisdom branded with that of legends, popular superstitions, and fabulous traditions. Of such events there are many in the life of Elizabeth. We have been as scrupulously exact in recounting them as in every other portion of her history. The very thought of omitting, palliating, or interpreting them with skillful moderation would have shocked us. It would have been in our eyes a sacrilege, to suppress what we believe as true, out of deference to the haughty reason of our age: it would have been a culpable want of accuracy, for these miracles are recorded by the same authorities as the other events which we narrate, and we should not have known what rule to follow in admitting their veracity in one case and denying it in others. In fine, it would have been an act of hypocrisy; for we avow without shrinking that we believe with the strongest good faith, the most miraculous occurrences which have been recorded of God's saints, and of St. Elizabeth in particular. It has not even cost us any sacrifice of our feeble reason, to attain this conviction; for nothing appears to us more reasonable and more natural in a christian, than that he should bow with gratitude before the mercies of his Lord, when he sees them suspend or modify those natural laws which they enacted, to secure and glorify the triumph of much higher laws in the moral and religious order. Is it not soothing and easy to conceive how souls, tempered as was Elizabeth's, and her contemporaries, elevated by faith and humility above the cold reasonings of earth, purified by every sacrifice and every virtue, living habitually, as though by anticipation, in heaven, presented a field ever ready for the operations of God's goodness: and how the faith of the people, ardent and simple, claimed, and in a manner justified, the frequent and familiar interposition of that Almighty power, which the senseless pride of our days, by denying, repels!"—p. 104.

Long as this quotation may be, we have in reality stopped short in the opening of a truly eloquent and feeling passage, which we would gladly have given at length. We have selected this portion, on account of the moral courage which it displays, and which is as requisite in France as in England for making such an avowal. We are rejoiced to see it; and we unhesitatingly say, that the life of St. Elizabeth would have been but as a moral tale, rich indeed in every display of virtue, but devoid of its most pathetic and consoling incidents; barren of that sublime interest, which the close communion of a soul, the simplest and purest, with heaven, must excite, had a cowardly respect for a scoffing or a doubting age induced our author to suppress a series of facts attested as strongly as any in history can be. We regret no less the necessity we are under of passing over several

other delightful pages, which treat of the honour paid to God's saints in those ages of simple faith. The rich source of practical thought which the virtues of His Blessed Mother in particular afforded; the influence, bland and salutary, which her devotion exerted upon society and character; the many forms in which this feeling blended with the love of nature, or the chivalry of life, illustrated as they are by the learning, published and manuscript, of the age, form a theme on which our author expatiates in a fervent strain, that does equal honour to his scholarship and to his heart.

Sensible that we have discharged our duty so inadequately towards the introduction of this valuable work, we feel no small discouragement at the idea of undertaking to analyse the biography itself. Indeed, we at once declare our inability to do any thing like justice to it. To condense is impossible, without stripping the life of its beauty of detail, and to extract is difficult where every chapter has its own peculiar charm. We propose, therefore, to ourselves no higher aim than to rouse the curiosity of the religious reader to a perusal of the entire work; and, if possible, to induce some one among them to translate the entire book into our language, as it has already been translated into German and Italian.

The life of St. Elizabeth is remarkable from exhibiting the purest perfection of Catholic virtue in every extreme of life, in the princess and the beggar: and all within the short duration, from birth to death, of twenty-four years. Daughter of the King of Hungary, she was asked in marriage for his son, by Hermann, Duke of Thuringia and Hesse, when she was only four years old. Her father, having acceded to his request, delivered her into the hands of the Duke's ambassadors with valuable presents; and she was conducted to the ducal castle of Wartburg, above the city of Eisenach, to be brought up in the company of her future husband Louis, who was a few years older than herself. They grew up like brother and sister, by which names they continued to call one another even after their happy marriage. Her early piety, and contempt of all pomp, drew upon her the ill-will of the court; and every effort was made, after the death of Duke Hermann, to induce Louis to send her home, and seek another match more suitable to his dignity. But the youthful prince had learnt to know and value her virtues, for his own life had been spotless from infancy, and proof against every temptation purposely thrown in his way. They were married when she was but thirteen, and led a life of wedded affection such as the world has seldom witnessed. In 1227 Louis took the cross; and after a farewell, the particulars

of which must move the dullest feelings, joined the Emperor in Italy, with the flower of German chivalry, whereof he was considered the brightest ornament. He was seized at Otranto with a fever, and died with such edifying piety, as to have received the honours of a saint.

During this first period of St. Elizabeth's life, one is at a loss which most to admire, the infantine simplicity of her character, or the regal magnificence of her charity. As to the first, although she joined in all the festive and splendid scenes of her court, although her gaiety and cheerfulness were the life of her board, she seems never to have been conscious either of her high rank, or of her superior qualities. As a wife, devoted with unbounded affection to one who as religiously returned her love, she wore the diadem and the embroidered robe simply because his station required it, and it made her pleasing in his eyes. So little did she seem to know the value of these splendid baubles, that if, on returning home from some public occasion in royal array, she found her purse exhausted, and the poor not all relieved, an embroidered glove, or a jewelled bracelet, or even her mantle of state, was given away, as applicable to no better use than to lighten their distress. And hence, when her husband went too far from home to bear her in his company, she instantly put on a widow's unadorned apparel, and wore it till his return. She always delighted in the company of the lowly and wretched; and when she had on such occasions of separation clothed herself in the dress which this class of persons generally wore, she would exclaim, in a spirit of foresight, if not of prophecy, "thus shall I walk, when I shall be poor and miserable for the love of my God." But on this quality of her character we must let her biographer be heard.

"We willingly acknowledge, that in the life of this saint, which we have studied with so much affection, no trait has appeared to us so moving, so worthy of admiration and envy, as this infantine simplicity, which may raise on some lips a disdainful smile. To our eyes, this guileless giving way to every impulse, her frequent smiles and tears, her girlish joys and uneasinesses, the innocent playfulness of her soul while reposing on the bosom of her heavenly Father, mingled as all these qualities were with such painful sacrifices, such serious thought, such a fervent piety, and a charity so devoted, so active, and so ardent, form a most charming and distinguished trait. But more particularly in an age like this, whereof the flowers are all withered, without their having first ripened into fruit, when all simplicity of character is extinct in the heart, and in domestic as much as in social and public life, no christian can study without emotion and without envy, how this quality developed and displayed itself in the soul of our Elizabeth, whose short life was no more than a prolonged and heavenly childhood,—an

unceasing obedience to the words of Our Saviour; when taking a little child and placing it in the midst of his disciples, he said, "Unless ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."—p. 63.

Of the extraordinary, or, as some would call it now-a-days, extravagant charity of St. Elizabeth, we have given an instance just now. This was in her an indefatigable virtue, and as varied in its manifestations as are the forms of human misery. She founded hospitals where she could serve the sick with her own royal hands; she refused food and alms to none that came to ask them; and she daily trod the rugged path from her castle to the city, to seek out such as were too feeble to ascend it. She stripped herself of her jewels, and again and again she cleared out her wardrobe, till she had no dress befitting her rank, or in which to meet visitors of her own condition. To understand, or even to justify this charitable prodigality, it must be observed, that her virtuous husband allowed her full liberty to dispose of what she pleased in this manner, and never murmured when he saw her apparently squandering her own and his possessions. A remarkable instance of this mutual good understanding occurred in 1226. The Duke was summoned to Italy by the Emperor, to assist him in his wars, and left his large estates under her government. He had scarcely departed, when a frightful famine invaded all Germany, and Thuringia in particular. The Duchess applied to the relief of the poor all the money in the treasury, amounting to 64,000 gold florins, an enormous sum in those days, which had been amassed by the sale of certain domains. In vain did the officers of state remonstrate and oppose her generosity; when the treasury was emptied, she opened the royal granaries, in which was corn valued at the price of two of the largest ducal castles and several cities. All this was most prudently distributed, so, that nine hundred poor received their daily sustenance at the castle. Twice a-day, the Duchess descended to the city to minister to the infirm; and she opened two new hospitals for their use. When the harvest drew near, she assembled all the poor; gave to each a sickle, a dress, and some money, and sent them to work in the fields. In a few months the Duke returned, to the great joy of all his people, and was met at some distance by his chief officers, who thought to avert his anger, by accusing his wife of having, in spite of their strong opposition, dissipated his treasure and emptied his stores. "His only answer was, 'Is my dear wife well? That is all I wish to know; what matters all the rest.' He then added, 'I wish you to allow my dear Elizabeth to give as much alms as she likes, and to assist, rather than contradict her. Let her give

all she pleases for the love of God, provided she only leaves me Eisenach, Wartburg, and Naumburg. God will restore all the rest whenever it pleaseth him; alms will never bring us to ruin.' Then he hastened to meet his dear Elizabeth; when she saw him, her joy knew no bounds—she threw herself into his arms, and kissed him a thousand times with heart and mouth. And while they thus embraced, he said to her, 'My dear sister, how have thy poor fared during this hard season?' To which she meekly answered, 'I have given unto God that which his was; and he hath kept for us what was thine and mine.'—p. 115.

If credit can be given to the unanimous testimony of contemporary writers, supported not only by the assent of Protestant historians, but by the tradition of the Lutheran population, Louis had reason, indeed, to allow full scope to her boundless charity. One of the beautiful histories, thus cherished in the faithful memory of the people, is the occurrence, often quoted in pious writers, of her husband surprising her as she descended the hill to the town, laden with provisions for the poor, and playfully insisting upon seeing what she bore in the gathered folds of her robe, when, to his amazement, the more so as it was the depth of winter, he found it filled with beautiful roses.

The reader may judge how much we have fallen short of the interest which this portion of our Saint's life possesses, when we inform him, that we have condensed, in these few paragraphs, what occupies one hundred and fifty pages, of large and close-printed, octavo, in the work before us. Arrived at the second period of her life, which begins with her husband's death, her biographer warns the few readers, who, his modesty supposes will have followed him through his work, that from that moment, they will find in her annals no attractions proceeding from human interest; that all the romantic features of her previous history vanish; and instead of the youthful princess, serving God in simplicity of heart, amidst the allurements of a dangerous station, they must expect to see a penitent, versed in all the rigours of an ascetic life, and treading the less singular, but rougher path of ordinary Christian perfection.

Following the advice of evil counsellors, her brothers-in-law seized on the supreme command, in detriment of the rights of Louis's children, and ordered his widow to depart with them at a moment's warning, and without any preparation, from the castle. At the same time, severe penalties were proclaimed in the city, against any one who should harbour her. She descended the hill in tears, bearing in her arms an infant, born since her husband's demise, while her other three children were led by her faithful maids of honour, whose depositions, after her death,

form the principal source of her biography. It was the depth of winter, yet every door in Eisenach was shut against her; of the thousands who had been relieved by her bounty, not one was found sufficiently generous to brave the inhuman decree pronounced by her relations. She at length took refuge in the shed of a public inn, appropriated to the swine, and supported herself by spinning, while her heart was engaged in prayer, and her soul daily purified from every terrene affection. During this period, she attained that sublime height of contemplative perfection, which has seldom been granted but to the poor and humble, and which forms a theme too holy to be touched on in this place.

The family of the princess could not long be kept in ignorance of her forlorn situation, and her uncle, the Bishop of Bamberg, gave her an asylum in the castle of Botenstein. Here she continued to spend her time in every practice of virtue, devotion, and charity, till summoned to Bamberg, by an important event. Her husband, before his death, had exacted a promise from his noblest followers, that, their crusade ended, they would bear his mortal remains to his own country, there to be buried among his dear monks at Reinhartsbrunn. After two years, they returned from Palestine, and passing by Otranto, disinterred his bones—placed them in a rich shrine, and bore them in solemn procession to Bamberg. There the afflicted widow met them, and gave vent to her last burst of human feeling. But the faithful knights, having learnt her wrongs, swore to revenge them; and immediately after the funeral obsequies of her husband, obliged her brothers-in-law, now ashamed of their unnatural conduct, to restore her to her station. The town of Marburg, with its territory, was assigned to her. Here she built herself a cottage, adjoining an hospital which she had founded; took the habit of St. Francis, with whom she had corresponded shortly before his death, and spent two heavenly years, divided between active charity, and divine contemplation. Her death, which was worthy of her life, and the details of which, as given by M. De Montalembert, in the simple language of the old chroniclers, are beautiful and most affecting, was soon followed by universal veneration. Her brother Conrad, after several years spent in frightful crimes, became a sincere penitent—entered the Teutonic order, of which he was soon the brightest ornament, and dedicated his abilities to founding the canonization of her, whom living, he had so grossly outraged. He lived long enough to commence the great Church of Marburg in her honour; the first, as we have before remarked, in the pointed style of Germany. We will not fatigue our readers with an account of the beautiful ceremony of St. Elizabeth's disinterment or translation,

at which upwards of a million of pilgrims attended from all parts of Europe, when her body was borne by Archbishops, assisted by the Emperor Frederic, who, taking the diadem from his brows, placed it upon hers—for the body was entire—saying, “As I could not crown her as my empress when living, I will crown her this day, as a queen immortal in the kingdom of God.”* Still less are we willing to disgust them, by the account which Lutheran writers have given us of the desecration of her shrine, by her descendant, the Landgrave Philip, whom Protestants surname “*the generous* ;” the same worthy to whom Dr. Martin Luther gave leave to have two wives. It is revolting and horrifying to the last degree, and shows, in its proper light, the character of one among the princes that honoured the Reformation, by their protection, and by their early adoption of its principles.

The sketch which we have given of this interesting and edifying biography, will suffice to show it possessed of, perhaps, stronger contrasts of situation, and a nobler scope for display of character, than any work of fiction would easily venture to invent. The spectacle of one, a duchess to-day, and an outcast to-morrow, a rich princess in the morning, and a beggar before night, seems scarcely within the reach of historical possibility, even in our days of revolutionary dethronements. But the sublime dignity of Catholic virtue which the sudden change calls into play, and the sterling value which the transition stamps upon the conduct of the better days, are such as have belonged, and yet belong, in various degrees, to the characteristics of our holy religion. Every Catholic must read this life—a type of many others which have been led within his Church—with feelings of pride and of gratitude; and what is more important, with improvement to his best and most valuable feelings. It affords lessons of instruction for the rich, and of consolation for the poor: it presents models for the religious contemplative, and for him who moves amidst the active occupations of life: it contains admirable rules of conduct for the single, the married, and the widowed: it exhibits beautiful examples of justice and condescension for a sovereign on the throne, as of resignation and noble independence for the lowest orders of society.

Historical parallels are an interesting pursuit, and our present number has already exhibited one between two chancellors of England; we feel almost tempted to institute a similar one between our Queen Elizabeth, and the saint who three centuries earlier bore her name. In perusing the life before us, we have

* This alludes to the offer of marriage made her by the Emperor, after her husband's death; an offer which, like several others, she firmly refused.

been involuntarily forced to contrast the two :—the one gracious and meek, the other haughty and overbearing ; the one simple and artless as a child, the other crafty and deceitful ; the one bountiful and charitable, the other griping and avaricious ; the one forgiving the grossest injuries with a smile, the other persecuting her favourites to death for a suspicion ; the one radiant in beauty, yet heedless of her charms, and casting her rich apparel to the poor, the other affecting artificial youth amidst wrinkles, and draining her courtiers' purses for presents of finery, and even commoner garments ;* the one faultless, as a virgin and as a wife, the other endeavouring to steer an unsafe course between the reputation of maidenhood, and the lubricity of scandalous amours ; the one, at the early age of twenty, ready to exchange her coronet for the humble cord of St. Francis, and riches for begging "for dear Jesus' sake," and expiring with joy at twenty-four, the other, withered in body and mind, after a life of seventy prosperous years, and a reign of forty-five, unable to make up her mind to leave the world, or even to speak of a successor : yet the first is but as one among many Catholic sovereigns and princesses of her own age ; her aunt St. Hedwige of Poland, her daughter Sophia of Hesse, her nieces St. Cune-gonda and St. Margaret of Hungary, her sister-in-law, B. Salome, her grand-niece and namesake, St. Elizabeth of Portugal, her contemporary and admirer, Blanche of Castille, the mother of St. Louis ; while the other stands alone—the paragon of Protestant queens ! The *Post* lately informed us that in August last, at a meeting held at Worcester to congratulate our young and gracious sovereign, the Lord Bishop of the city related the following anecdote :—

"About eight or nine years ago, the Duchess of Kent had requested the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Lincoln to come to Kensington for the purpose of examining into the proficiency of the youthful princess in her education. One of the right reverend prelates, observing that the princess had been lately reading the History of England, said to her, 'Pray tell me what opinion you have formed of Queen Elizabeth.' The princess, with the modesty and timid deference belonging to her character, answered, 'I think that Queen Elizabeth was a very great queen, but I am not quite so sure she was so good a woman.'" (Great applause.)

We are rather tempted to doubt, whether, on putting the question, the right reverend interrogator anticipated the second clause in the answer ; for it looks to us as if intended to elicit some display of sectarian feeling, perhaps some sentiment which could lead to a proposal of her as a model of the Pro-

* Lingard, viii. p. 499. 2nd ed.

testant queen. If so, all was baffled by the upright sense and heart of the young princess, who, we are glad to see, had so early learnt to prize moral, above regal greatness. We trust too, though the anecdote does not state it, that the right reverend interrogator proceeded to say, that some mistake lurked in the wise and virtuous reply, and reminded his royal pupil that no sovereign deserved to be called great, who was not good. If, indeed, after the exposures of modern historical research, there still hang an ideal charm about the royal name "Elizabeth," we are sure that it would be sooner converted into a real one, in her who should copy, so far as circumstances permit, the mild and amiable virtues of the German princess, than in any who should chuse as a pattern the murderess of Mary Stuart. The blood of *our* St. Elizabeth has flowed into every noble line of Germany, till we believe it has now reached our throne: may similar virtues attend the proud descent!

ART. VI.—1. *The Angler in Ireland, or an Englishman's Ramble through Connaught and Munster, in the Summer of 1833.* London, 1834.

2. *Journey throughout Ireland, in the Spring, Summer, and Autumn of 1834.* By H. D. Inglis, Esq. London, 1835.

3. *A Tour round Ireland in the Summer of 1835.* By John Barrow, Jun. Esq. London, 1836.

THE anomalous spectacle Ireland presents to the eye of a stranger, attracts the attention of even the most superficial tourist. They are surprised to observe as fertile a soil as Europe can boast of, and a country with one-fourth of its population in a state of pauperism; millions of acres of uncultivated land, and hundreds of thousands of able yet unemployed labourers: splendid barracks, capacious prisons, and crowded hospitals. In short, a land teeming with plenty, and a half-starved people!

Some ingenious theorists attribute these, and every other evil incident to human nature, to "Popery." Yet on looking abroad, they find, unfortunately for their theory, that wherever the same cause exists, it produces a diametrically opposite effect, for in many of those states where the Catholic religion prevails, the people are happy, orderly, and industrious; nor do those countries where sovereigns happen to profess a different faith

from the majority of their subjects, form exceptions. Ireland is now in a state of transition, emerging from the paralyzing effect of centuries of misrule, penal laws, and local oppression. Emancipation and reform, though tardily and reluctantly extorted, are beginning to exercise their beneficial influences, and gradually rescuing the Irish people from absolute despair. At length they hail the blessings of education, which an enlightened government has extended to the rising generation, as a first step towards reconstructing the shattered frame-work of society.

The grievances of Ireland are so numerous, and of such long standing, that she has been metaphorically designated, "a hydra who is perpetually tearing herself." The most influential organ of the party which has so long inflicted on her all the horrors of Orange-Tory despotism, draws the following too true picture of the result of their own barbarous policy.

"In Ireland alone is to be found a population abandoned to the mercy of the elements of chance, or rather of the legal owners of the soil, who are protected by an armed police, and a strong military garrison, in the exaction of unheard-of pecuniary rents, from a destitute tenantry—rents which are only paid by the exportation of the great bulk of the food raised in the country, leaving those who grow it, a bare subsistence on a diet of potatoes, eked out by weeds.

"There rests not so foul a blot, we fearlessly assert, on the character of any other government; the wretchedness of the mass of the people has no parallel on the face of the globe in any nation, savage or civilized; a population of eight millions left to live or die, as it may happen. How has man prevented the obvious intention of God—to provide every comfort of life for all! One-third of the rich soil lies yet uncultivated, the rest but half-tilled by a dispirited, starved, naked, beggarly, and discontented people; the bulk of the produce of whose industry, such as it is, is swept off to other lands, to be sold for the exclusive benefit of men, whom the law invests with the unconditional ownership of this fair portion of God's earth, and with the power, if they so choose, of absolutely starving all its inhabitants.

"And this law, we wisely expect this unhappy population to cherish, venerate, and *implicitly obey*. Shame, shame, we repeat, on that state which shall be the last to recognise the claim of the orphan, the widow, the sick, and the aged, on the charity of their wealthy neighbours."—*Quarterly Review*, Dec. 1835.

It is not in our power to use any stronger language to express our abhorrence of the iron despotism, which "a miserable monopolizing minority" has hitherto exercised over unhappy Ireland, than that just quoted from the leading journal of the faction, who can hypocritically affect to lament the deplorable effect of *one* of their own sins of omission, viz. the non-introduction of poor-laws. During their long tenure of office, they have brought

a fine country to the brink of ruin, and degraded a brave, generous, and intelligent people, leaving to their successors the task of rescuing their victims from so many evils.

An obvious query, now that this accumulated misery is recognized, is, why resist the application of salutary remedies in order to remove it? Such as a settlement of the tithe question, a modified system of poor-laws, and a reform of corporation abuses. "The Church is in danger," is the answer; will the danger be diminished by leaving the tottering fabric of an Established Church, as the *only obstacle* to the reform of every existing abuse?

The church militant has an auxiliary in the House of Lords; they have hitherto made common cause, and succeeded so far, in stifling every attempt to legislate for Ireland on liberal principles. Oppressors are seldom at a loss for a pretext; their last resource being the tyrant's plea—necessity.

In the Island of St. Domingo, the French asserted that the negroes were a degraded race, because of their colour, and because "their facial angle was too acute for intellect." Acting on this principle, they endeavoured "to keep the negroes down;" but the result was, that the French were soon driven out of the Island, and the despised blacks formed a republic, which subsists to this day! A word to the wise.

Mr. Jefferson, the American President and slave-owner, tried to palliate republican slavery, on the ground that the slave population were a distinct race, "aliens" forsooth. A certain factious opponent of the Queen's government, a countryman of this same Jefferson, alleges on pretty nearly the like pretext, that the Irish nation is not entitled to free institutions, and equal rights with the English. It remains to be seen if any British peer will be bold enough to persevere in the same hazardous course in the next Session of Parliament, when no longer secretly abetted by the Court, in opposition to the wishes of a majority of the people, constitutionally expressed, as we doubt not they will be, through their representatives.

Time is the greatest of innovators: the oftener the points at issue with regard to Ireland are discussed, the more apparent the just rights of that deeply injured nation become, and the inevitable necessity of their accomplishment, solely by intellectual means, without any intermixture of physical force, displayed by the force of truth, aided by the resistless weapons of powerful eloquence, in and out of Parliament. One master-mind, the champion of his oppressed country, an unshackled press, and peaceful organization, are the overwhelming political engines constitutionally called into action.

"The world," says another highly-gifted Irishman, "beholds the

anomalous spectacle, that has ever since the reign of Henry II been presented by the two nations. The one subjected without being subdued; the other, rulers but not masters. The one doomed to all that is monstrous in independence, without its freedom; the other, indued with every attribute of despotism, without its power."—*Moore's History of Ireland.*

Local oppression and the tithe system were the origin of all the disturbances in Ireland during the last century, from the first White-boy insurrection in 1759, down to the Rockites and Ribbonmen of the present time.

At the period of the accession of William IV, several of the most extensive and populous counties were under the Insurrection Act, and now, not a single barony has been proclaimed for the last two years! The Tories, without ever attempting to *strike at the root of the evil*, contented themselves with passing bills to put down the insurrection, and any temporary expedient to put off the evil day.

The *Quarterly Review* disingenuously conceals the master grievance of Ireland, merely the "*suppressio veri*," as to the greatest of all anomalies—a Protestant Church in a Catholic country, and that unfortunately the poorest country, notwithstanding the fertility of its soil, almost in Europe; yet it possesses the richest Church establishment, with the smallest congregation attached to it, in proportion to the entire population, extant. The *Quarterly Review* is a high-church zealot, and zealots are all formed of the same materials, whatever be their party. The three works before us, are written by zealous Protestants, two of them orthodox members of the Anglican Church, yet they cannot adduce a solitary fact, in the whole course of their progress throughout the Island, tending to prove that the "Church" has been in any way conducive to the peace, the happiness, or the prosperity of the country; on the contrary, it is impossible to deny the melancholy evidence presented on every side, demonstrating that it has been a fertile source of expenditure, and almost unmitigated evil, by the profanation of God's name to the purposes of bigotry and faction.

The "Angler," (an English clergyman, we understand) has generally a happy way of expressing his meaning, and is tolerably free from prejudice, lamenting however, with amusing gravity, the fact, "that unfortunately the Roman Catholic religion is that of a vast majority of the Irish people." He does not confine his remarks to aquatic sports, (though those who are fond of such, will take a peculiar interest in his ramble to the west of Ireland, which affords abundant scope for that pleasing recreation;) graphic descriptions of the less frequented parts of Gal-

way and Kerry, particularly the wild district of Connemara; and the romantic barony of Iveragh, diversify his amusing volumes.

Differing as all these travellers do in most other respects, they agree in acknowledging the proverbial hospitality of the Irish, but are sorely afflicted with a malady, well known on the British side of the Channel—the O'Connell-phobia: whilst they render an involuntary homage to the transcendent talents, and well-merited popularity of the illustrious patriot, they dread the power of the "great agitator" for good or evil.

Though these gentlemen traversed the country before that happy epoch, when the mild yet firm government of Lord Mulgrave, made disturbed districts and proclaimed baronies obsolete terms, they travelled with perfect safety to purse and person, at all hours of the day and night. Such is the discriminating faculty of the people, that "the stranger" was always privileged, even where the laws were set at defiance against the local oppressor.

Much as a rapacious oligarchy has done to degrade the Irish peasantry, no national character has obtained more general eulogy from intelligent travellers of all ranks, than they have. Mr. Bicheno, writing some years ago, says,

"The Irish peasant is now what he was in the days of Swift—scantily clad, wretchedly housed, miserably fed, and grievously rack-rented."

Prince Puckler Muskau, in his entertaining Tour, sums up their character in the following words:—

"The Irish people, taken in a body, with all their wildness, unite the frank honesty and poetical temper of the Germans; the vivacity and quickness of the French, and the pliability, naturalness and submission of the Italians. It may, with the fullest justice be said of them, that their faults are to be ascribed to others; their virtues to themselves."

Count Montalembert, speaking of their piety and attachment to their clergy, says,

"Each brings, at Christmas and Easter, the small means which his economy has saved, for the support of the priest and the temple of the Lord. All give in proportion to their means, and with a good will."

To these beautiful tributes to the excellent qualities of the Irish peasant, we may add, that amidst all his wretchedness, unequalled perhaps at any time in any part of the habitable globe, he preserves a degree of patience, and even cheerfulness, such as we rarely notice in more favoured lands.

Mr. Barrow, Junior, is one of those holiday tourists, who, from the habit of writing in some public office in London for

ten months of the year, cannot even suffer his pen to rest during the other two, intended for relaxation. No sooner on board a steam-boat, than, seized with the scribbling mania, they set to work with such assiduity, that the common result of a few weeks' excursion is a goodly octavo, wherein, through the medium of Mr. Murray, of Albemarle Street, they "bestow their tediousness" on the reading public. It is not, therefore, surprising that Mr. Barrow's book—like those of the whole genus he belongs to—affords innumerable proofs of the mighty imperfect knowledge he contrived to pick up during his "Tour round Ireland, in the Summer of 1835." Professing to eschew politics and religion, a pretty strong Tory bias pervades most of his remarks; mixing exclusively with one party, it was not to be expected that he could give either a correct or impartial account of a country of which he took so superficial a glance, or of a people, whose present unhappy state is mainly attributable to the oppression of that very party.

Notwithstanding the disclaimer touching religion, Mr. Barrow artfully slips in not a few prosing pages on the interdicted topic, contributed, however, by a lady, a pious member no doubt of the "Hibernian Auxiliary branch Missionary Society for the Conversion of the benighted Catholics." A most prejudiced account of the Rev. Mr. Nagle's new reformation expedition to Achil island on the coast of Mayo, is the theme, whose absurdity is amply apparent, from internal evidence, to render it nugatory, even if the learned and venerable Dr. M'Hale had not condescended to refute it by stating the real facts, in reply to the calumnies with which pseudo-saints assailed him. The dulness of Mr. Barrow's book is in some measure redeemed by its embellishments, which are a few amusing sketches by that clever artist Maclise: we shall dismiss it without farther notice. Indeed, the only novelty it contains is a discovery made by its ingenious author at Curraghmore, the seat of the Marquis of Waterford, that his lordship, "though a little wild, is, like all the Beresfords, kind and good-hearted!" This is surely ironical. The noble Marquis has hitherto obtained only an unenviable degree of notoriety for "kindness" in the police reports at home and abroad. As to the archbishops, bishops, and benefited clergymen, who rejoice in that patronymic, their goodness of heart consists in "kindly relieving" Ireland every year of the entire produce of upwards of a hundred thousand acres of its best land; and we have yet to learn, if any portion of what these clerical Beresfords have so long been receiving from the Church, has ever, through the media of hospitals, schools, or charitable institutions of any description, devolved to the use or benefit of

the public. Field-Marshal Lord Beresford displayed a singular proof of "goodness of heart," by ejecting his poor Catholic tenants in Carlow who voted for the liberal candidate, to die of cold and hunger on the high road, on the principle (from Scripture, of course) that "a man has a right to do what he likes with his own!" Another Beresford, a Dublin alderman, in days of yore, used to administer rather *striking* proofs of the "tenderness of his heart" to the citizens of Dublin. The most recent instance of this family good quality was evinced by the Rev. William Beresford, of swan-shot notoriety, during the "dragonades" of Lord Haddington's disastrous, but fortunately ephemeral government: this climax of "kindness" and Christian charity consisted in shedding innocent blood to collect the hateful tribute of tithes from a famishing peasantry. And is it a matter of astonishment that cool calculating Englishmen decline to insure the lives of Irish parsons of this stamp?—yet such is the forbearance of the patient people of Ireland, that any office might open policies with perfect safety, even on the lives of those fanatical itinerants—the O'Sullivans and M'Ghees, who have travelled all over the three kingdoms, as the hired libellers of their own countrymen.

Mr. Inglis's work is one of higher pretensions than either of the other two we have mentioned. Favorably known as a popular traveller, he is often quoted, and perhaps more weight has been attached to his opinions than they deserve. This gentleman devoted much attention (considering the limited stay he made anywhere) to the actual state of that most interesting class of society, the peasantry—investigating with praiseworthy industry the rate of wages and labour, the value of provisions, and the complicated relation between landlord and tenant, with their various subdivisions of middle-men, under-tenants, and cotters. Rents, tithes, rates, and burdens of every description, which clog the machine of rural economy, attracted his observation, eliciting many shrewd remarks, and some useful suggestions. The result of these enquiries enabled him to anticipate, as he says, the Poor Law Commissioners' report, but as that elaborate document and the report of Mr. Nicholls, are long since before the public, and a system of poor laws for Ireland is likely speedily to be carried into effect, we are precluded the necessity of adverting to a subject already fully discussed in our pages.

We understand that there is recently established at Limerick (where much misery exists) a Mont-de-Piété on the model of that of Paris;—were every large town in Ireland provided with such an institution, it would be the means of furnishing part of

a fund necessary for the support of their pauper population under the projected poor law system. Thus the scheme would be productive of benefit to the public, in alleviating the burden of the poor, levied on the necessities of the very poor themselves. The beneficial effects of the Limerick Mont-de-Piété, though only five months in operation, are already perceptible: the profits arising from it were intended to defray the expenditure of Barrington's Hospital, but as that munificent institution is now by act of Parliament made the public hospital of the city of Limerick, and provided for from other sources, a considerable fund may be rendered available from the Mont-de-Piété; it borrows money at six per cent, and lends it on pledges at twenty per cent per annum, or four-pence in the pound monthly, which is lower than the pawnbrokers' rate of interest, and no charge is made for tickets; 20,000 have already been issued, three-fourths of them for articles under five shillings value. The sum at present (September) invested is about £5,000, but it is calculated that £20,000 may be employed, which will produce a clear yearly benefit of nearly £3,000 to the public.

Mr. Inglis's book having passed through several editions, and been published upwards of two years, its merits are now well known, and we shall not, therefore, give any extracts from it. In spite of his religious prejudices, which are generally acknowledged and pretty strongly evinced in his tour in Ireland, as well as its precursor, "*Spain*," and occasional defects of a less serious nature, we regret that this is the last work we shall have from the lively and entertaining pen of its amiable author, whose wanderings in "*many lands*" we have perused, if not always with profit, certainly with pleasure.

An eminent statesman, lately addressing his constituents, (the most numerous in the empire) said:—"If an Established Church is valuable because it provides for the religious wants of the poor, the Church of Ireland does exactly the reverse of this; it provides for the rich only, and compels the poor to pay for both." The Irish branch of the Church of England was established there on two grounds: one religious, the other political. To make proselytes from the Catholic population, and to strengthen "the Protestant interest," cementing by means of a common Church Establishment the bond of union between England and Ireland, was the language held by its advocates. How far either of these objects has been attained, a very short reference to official documents will suffice to show. By a return made to the Irish House of Lords, in the year 1734, the population of Catholics to Protestants then in Ireland was just two to one; half a century later, (1788) the population (4,040,000

according to G. P. Bush) was about double the previous numbers; the increase, in spite of penal laws not long repealed, was wholly on the part of the Catholics, the Protestant population remaining stationary: and a few years (in 1805) after the Union, Newenham estimated the population at 5,395,000, when the proportion of Catholics to Protestants had augmented four to one, only one half of the latter belonging to the Established Church; and the increase of Catholics has continued in the same progressive ratio to the present day. Having failed in a religious point of view in "propagating the faith," we believe no man will have the hardihood to deny, that as a political institution, the Irish Church, so far from having produced any beneficial effect, has degraded Ireland, and brought shame upon the English name. Yet this is the fulcrum on which the Tories have placed a lever of national bigotry, in order to raise themselves by means of it into power, and the disaffected Orange party once more to the sweets of office.

The anomalous position of the Anglo-Irish clergy, brings them in constant collision with the people—their flocks, as they facetiously term them—and places them in hostility to the government, whose measures, so far from aiding, they are most actively engaged in opposing. Thus the Sovereign, who has the disposal of bishopricks and superior benefices, finds her ministers thwarted, and the benevolent intentions of the legislature for tranquillising the country, counteracted, by those very men who are indebted to the crown for their preferments.

Such is the result of the abortive experiment of a political Church, with its tithes, pluralities, and abuses; forming in every respect an antithesis to the "Church of the people," whose stability depends on *its* poverty, and on *their* piety: its ministers are rising in public estimation, whilst those of the law-Church are sinking by their own rapacity, incurring much odium, and getting little money, by an endeavour to extract, like clerical alchemists, wealth out of the baser metals of human suffering, by legal and military processes.

Nor are the tithe-payers more pleased with the part they play: we speak not now of the natural and conscientious repugnance of Catholic proprietors and tenants to the tribute; but we can state as a fact, familiar to those who reside in Ireland, that the Protestant landowners are actually the most energetic opponents of what is called "a settlement of the tithe question," *unless by a total abolition of tithes.*

The objection of the Protestant landlords to tithes (always excepting lay impropiators) is not that the per centage proposed to be deducted is too much or too little, nor to the appropriation

clause, about which they do not care one straw; nor to the tax out of the livings for moral and religious instruction; it is because the bill does not go far enough, that is, *to the annihilation of tithes in name, and in nature*, in order that they may hold their land free from any church burden whatsoever, which they allege is just so much deducted from the rent. In the valedictory address of a defeated candidate at the recent election for an Irish county, he complains that three hundred Conservative Protestant landlords refused him their votes, yet he is a staunch Conservative, and whilst in Parliament always opposed the ministerial tithe bill!

The chief argument in favour of the tithe system, is that it *is* the law of the land; but the law is an unjust one, and ought to be repealed, which repeal, the present generation, it cannot be doubted, will witness. We are not going to discuss here so complicated a question, blended as it is with so many conflicting interests, but we have no doubt that if tithes were abolished, provision might be made by the state to secure to the Established clergy their respective benefices, (a life interest in which is all they can claim) and even some compensation to lay-impropriators for their *valid* rights.

The mass of property bequeathed by the piety of Catholic benefactors of former ages, and confirmed by the legislature since the change of religion in England, (for in Ireland no such general change ever took place) now possessed by the Established Church, has been sometimes overrated. According to Parliamentary returns, the glebe lands are 82,645 acres, worth at least £2 an acre, and no doubt yield more. By a report of the Commons, on ecclesiastical revenue in Ireland, dated March 1833, the bishops' lands were 485,532 acres, not comprising 184,000 acres of unprofitable land; making the grand total of Church land amount to about 750,000 statute acres, three-fourths of which are the best land, situated in the most fertile districts of the respective dioceses. The income derived from these (exclusive of glebe land) is, by the official returns, only £151,127. 12s. 4d., though chiefly arable, and worth at least one to two pounds an acre to the lessees; but owing to the mode of leasing bishops' lands and levying fines, it is extremely difficult to estimate their real value. Thirty years ago, the fertile land in Ireland, (exclusive of 4,800,000 acres of waste land) was computed at 13,454,000 statute acres: supposing all the cultivated land subject to tithe to be only eight millions of plantation (Irish) acres, it would yield in money tithes, at eighteen-pence per acre, on the same principle as those parishes already brought under the composition act, £668,000 a-year;

and this enormous sum, besides the 750,000 acres of land above stated, is allotted for the cure of 852,000 souls, the actual number belonging to the Established Church. The prelates have also the patronage (as a provision for their families and friends) of 921 benefices and superior dignities, out of the 1280 benefices comprised in the 2,500 parishes of Ireland; many are formed into unions, detrimental to the Church, and far from beneficial to the people. The richest archbishop in France has £1,000 a-year; the poorest bishop in Ireland £4,000!—the richest French bishop has *less* than the poorest Irish rector (£400 a-year)! The annual expense of the Church of Prussia is £300,000, for a population of 13,566,000; and that of the kingdom of the Netherlands, before its separation from Catholic Belgium, (population 6,000,000 of inhabitants) was only £252,000 a-year, for Catholic and Protestant clergy of both. The annual revenue and cost of the Kirk of Scotland, according to a writer in the “*Edinburgh Catholic Magazine*” for December, 1832, do not exceed £338,000, the Scottish people being chiefly Protestant as is well known, and this for a population of 2,500,000, one half of whom are comprised within the pale of the Established (Presbyterian) Church, which has 928 parishes and about a hundred chapels of ease. Let the expense of these several Churches, at home and abroad, be compared by any disinterested and impartial individual, keeping in mind that Ireland is one of the poorest countries in Europe, and its Church is about the richest—that nine-tenths of the population do not belong to that Church; and then enquire if a people can be contented where religion is made a matter of revenue, which can seldom be collected without resorting to legal violence, often attended with the shedding of human blood?

The worst enemies of the stability of the Irish Church—a mere political establishment—are those who resist the reform of its inveterate abuses. No institution, civil or religious, which is not rooted in the affections of the people, nor calculated to benefit the community at large, can ever be constructed on a firm and lasting basis: and when the sacred name of religion is prostituted to serve the purposes of a faction, to maintain a system of monopoly, and to engender hatred and prejudice between the professors of different creeds, even the pretext of “the Church” being a connecting link between England and Ireland, will not avail the opponents of every amelioration relating to the latter country: their “ingenious devices” are detected, and the people of Ireland—long a proscribed race in the land of their birth—now that they *know* their rights, will no longer submit to persecution and contumely, for the sake of upholding the unholy fabric.

The Catholic hierarchy and clergy neither ask, nor would they consent to receive, government stipends in any shape, as dependants on the state; they demand no *regium donum* like the Presbyterian ministers of Ulster, nor a share of the wealth possessed by the Established clergy, having publicly and solemnly disclaimed any such intentions: they prefer the voluntary system, trusting for their support, and the decent maintenance of the Church under their charge, to the piety and attachment of their flocks, like the pastors of the primitive Christian Church, who diffused its holy influence unaided by tithes, collected, as in Ireland, at the point of the bayonet!

The exemplary Catholic priesthood, though they derive no emolument from the state, have, like the laity of that Church, ever been distinguished for loyalty, and firm attachment to the monarchical principle, as well as to the faith they derived from their ancestors; submitting to proscription and forfeitures, by the republican party under Cromwell, for their adherence to the unfortunate Stuarts; and even during the darkest epoch of modern Irish history, (1798) scarcely a Catholic of note was engaged in that sanguinary struggle.

We were incorrect in saying that the Catholic clergy received *nothing* from the state; there is a yearly parliamentary grant of £9,000 for Maynooth College—just enough to put them under a seeming obligation, most certainly not worth incurring for so paltry a sum, when compared to the importance of the object for which it is intended—the education of the priesthood of nine-tenths of the people of Ireland; being less than the one hundredth part of the amount annually appropriated to the support of the clergy of the Protestant part—that is, the remaining tenth of the population of the country.* Yet twelve Tories were found in the House of Commons hardy enough to object to this insignificant pittance, on the pitiful pretext of conscientious scruples, forgetting that, on the same principle, were Catholics to resort to religious cant, they would refuse contributing to support a double Church as repugnant to *their* conscience.

The abolition of parish cess (church rates) in Ireland, was a boon of considerable importance. The establishment of an efficient police was another of still greater value, particularly since it has been weeded of Orangemen and all members of secret societies. This corps is so well composed, so admirably organized and disciplined, that it has now become a strictly constitutional force, and by no means unpopular;—this is saying much for any police, which at best can only be considered in the

* See Dublin Review, No. III.

light of a necessary evil, often resulting from distempered times. We have no hesitation in saying, that the Irish constabulary might serve as a model for a rural police, so much wanted in England. Ireland is also indebted to the present ministry for the reform of the grand jury (Act 6th and 7th William IV). The appointment of county surveyors, and the stop put to "jobbing," which the grand jurors were accused of in their fiscal capacity, and the application of the public money granted to employ the poor, and the discharge of arrears of rent due by their own tenants; these were boons of paramount importance to every Irish county, besides the general amelioration of the whole system which has arisen from the new act. The landlord still contrives to keep the unfortunate tenant in his power, by exacting a rent he knows it is quite impossible for the latter to pay, thus compelling him to vote as he chooses, under pain of ejectment, i. e. ruin; availing himself of every improvement that raises the value of his property from the industry of the occupier; but the expenditure of local taxation (as exemplified by the evidence of the late Mr. Nimmo,) can no longer be appropriated exclusively for the profit of the landlord.

"The universal principle throughout Ireland, by which roads are made under the grand jury presentments, is this: the labourer makes the road, and is allowed the value as an offset against his rent by the landlord—not always the head landlord, but the immediate landlord—who receives the money from the county treasurer.

"I conceive this abuse arises from the circumstance, that the money raised by an assessment of the whole county, may be applied exclusively to those places where interest, or, as it is called, *jobbing*, on the grand jury, permits it being disposed of."*

Query, Was the money actually laid out in the way most convenient to the landlords' demesne? At all events, it generally found its *way* into his pocket.

It is a pleasing evidence of returning prosperity, well known to every one conversant with Irish affairs, to observe, that *rents are now better paid* than they have been for many years past in Ireland.

It is not necessary to seek for political or religious causes, though neither were wanting, to account for that restless disposition and insubordination which has unhappily so long characterized the Irish peasantry. Local oppression is the bane of Ireland; the despotism of petty tyrants, who exercised a summary power over their unfortunate tenants, and ground them

* Mr. Nimmo's evidence before a Committee of the House of Lords, 1824.

down to the dust, has hitherto been the discreditable system of government; unequal laws, administered by Orange magistrates (lay and clerical), reduced a hardy, active, intelligent people, to the miserable condition of mere serfs.

“Drain’d by *tithes* of his store,
Punish’d next for being poor,—
This is the poor wretch’s lot
Born within the straw-roofed cot.”

This picture of the Irish peasant is drawn by the graphic pen of Robert Southey, Poet Laureate, author of the “Book of the Church:” *we* have only substituted the word “tithes” for “taxes.” Mr. Nimmo, whom we have already quoted, says,—“The Irish landlord has greater power than in any state I know,—he is not bound to protect the tenant in case of distress or starvation, as he is in England or Livonia, where they cultivate the land by predial slaves, or even as the owners of negro slaves in the West Indies are.”

During the long period of Tory misrule, when the country was governed by a monopolizing faction, to whom alone was confined the administration of unjust laws, neither life nor property were secure; and such was the misery every where prevalent, that the (greatly enlarged) jails were filled with *mendicant* criminals, in order that they might at least have food and lodging, which their own wretched hovels did not afford: and it is a well-authenticated fact, that, in Dublin, 20,000 persons died in one year of absolute want, whilst abundance of food was being exported to England for the benefit of absentee landlords, and 60,000 patients (one-fourth of the whole population of the capital) passed through the fever hospitals in the year 1826, a vast proportion of whom were afflicted, not with sickness, but—hunger!

In Ireland, unlike every other country, there scarcely exists any community of interest between landlord and tenant, though in bitter irony they are called “their benefactors;”—assuredly no other relation is recognized between the one and the other than that of buyer and seller, in mercantile language; the proprietor looks upon his land as so much merchandise, from which the highest rate of profit must be extracted, and in order to do so, the tenant is kept in a state of villainage like the vassal of a feudal baron to his superior. The natural connexion subsisting between landlord and tenant is never cemented by that friendly intercourse so necessary in a moral and political point of view, and which generally prevails all over England and Scotland—where the landlord builds houses and farm-steading

for the accommodation of the cultivator of his land; but in miserable Ireland, he finds nothing but the ground. There is, in fact, just the same degree of sympathy between the parties, as if the one were a tradesman and the other his customer. It is a mistaken notion to suppose, that when an English landlord remits part of his rent in consequence of a bad harvest, the concession is looked upon by him, or accepted by his tenant, as an act of charity, which it would be deemed in Ireland—the spontaneous gift of an individual of a rare genus, liberal landlords—for in England such deductions are so very common, under particular exigencies, that the farmer regards them almost as a matter of prescriptive right.

The most praiseworthy attempt that has been made by a liberal government, to counteract the manifold evils under which Ireland has been suffering, was to disseminate the blessing of education among the lower orders, through the means of national schools. In Sir Henry Parnell's evidence, he states, that a very few years ago, eleven counties were without a single bookseller's shop; literature is still at a very low ebb in many of the provincial towns, which are chiefly dependant on itinerant book-venders for their supply. The means of education are offered to the whole population of the country by the national system, now in full vigour, which has received the stamp of almost universal approbation, a few unworthy cavillers in either house of parliament forming the exception; alleging, what they ought to know is false, that it is anti-scriptural. And if a despicable minority persist in refusing permission to those under their control, to take the advantage of sound instruction, on their head be the guilt they commit against the laws of God and man. We need not pass any eulogium on a system which has already been the means of preventing crime, and of improving the moral and religious habits of the rising generation: the report of the Education Committee will, we are convinced, bear us out in the assertion, that the national schools of Ireland have been productive of "the greatest benefit to the greatest number."

A still more pitiful ground of objection, is, that some of the schools under the new Board of Education are near chapels, and others in nunneries. We see no reason why the *vicinity* of a Catholic chapel should prove injurious to the scholars of any creed; moreover, no particular faith is inculcated, the system being founded on principles precisely the reverse of exclusive; and if benevolent females, who devote their lives to the purposes of religious exercises, and the education of youth, are willing to instruct poor children—though Catholics—gratuitously, we may say, (for what object can a few pounds, and some books, received

from the National Board, be to an institution where four hundred pupils are taught)—let them, in God's name, go on and prosper, "with no reward but the consciousness of spending their lives in an humble endeavour to do good:"—such are the words of a Scotch Protestant, who visited Ireland last autumn, and published his remarks in that cheap and useful periodical, *Chambers's Edinburgh Journal*, from which we make the following extract on the subject of tuition by nuns:—

"In the course of our ramble through the streets of Tralee, we observed the modest sign-board of a national school fixed upon the walls of a convent, and we applied for admittance. We were presently ushered into a large hall, containing a vast assemblage of female children, who, as in the former instance, were receiving a gratuitous education from the nuns. It was pleasing to find, that, even in this remote part of the empire, the intellectual mode of instruction had been in a great measure adopted. The children acquitted themselves extremely well, and appeared to have not only profited by the direct lessons of the school, but also by the example of the elegant style of elocution and lady-like manners, held up to them by their mistresses.

"The ladies of this convent have kept school for many years, so that the children of several of their earlier pupils are now under their charge—a fact which speaks to the appreciation of education among the lower orders of the Irish. They teach four hundred pupils, with no reward but the consciousness of spending their lives in an humble endeavour to do good.

"Like the ladies at Kilkenny, they seemed anxious to impress upon us, that, so occupied, they could not be otherwise than happy. Lately they have been relieved of some part of the expenses of the school, by an annual contribution of sixteen pounds! and a few school books, by the National Board of Education, whose regulations they have accordingly adopted.

"The aid given by convents towards education in Ireland appears to be considerable. In Kilkenny we had found one, in which five hundred children were instructed; at Tralee, we were now visiting one, which gave instruction to four hundred; and a friend mentions, that he lately visited one at Galway, where the number of pupils was three hundred:—making twelve hundred children at three nunneries."

Mr. Butler Bryan, an Irish barrister, published a book some years ago, strongly urging the introduction of poor-laws, as a remedy for the most prominent evils and general distress then (in 1830) unhappily prevalent in Ireland. We perfectly agree with him, that a legal provision for the indigent and helpless will not dry up the sources of private charity, as Dr. Chalmers, and other pseudo-philanthropic writers on political economy, apprehend. Charity, in Ireland especially, is open-handed; sympathy for distress in any shape is one of the finest characteristics of the national disposition:—even the poor never refuse to share their scanty vegetable food with those who are poorer still!

Mr. Bryan's work has furnished us with some details which we had been unable to collect ourselves, relating to that most essential of all means for the amelioration of Ireland—the employment of the people in public and private undertakings, such as making roads, quays, and bridges, draining bogs, and improving the vast tracts of waste land still uncultivated, which would almost obviate the necessity of emigration; for, in point of fact, there is by no means that redundancy of population in the country commonly imagined. Moreover, as this intelligent writer remarks, “the history of every country proves, that the vacuum caused by emigration is immediately filled up, so that it is no remedy for a supposed surplus.”

In England, enclosure bills are perhaps too numerous, depriving the poor of the use of commons which they had enjoyed from time immemorial; and such is the rapid progress of agricultural improvement, that six millions of acres of land are calculated to have been enclosed in Great Britain during the last century.

“If,” says Mr. Bryan, “the landlords of Ireland were compelled by a labour rate to do their duty, there cannot be the slightest doubt that Ireland would give employment to more than her own population.

“With all the sources of productive labour for an increasing population, the emigration scheme is a political bubble—the worst offspring of the wildest and most mischievous reveries of Malthus.

“However interested individuals may seek to disguise the fact, it is alone to the pressure of the population in almost every country, that mankind are indebted for their deliverance from oppression: it is the urgent wants of an increasing population, that have forced legislators to reform bad laws, and have instigated the people to co-operate for their common benefit. This has produced a division of labour that multiplies and perfects all productions in a manner most miraculous.” *Practical View of Ireland*, p. 287.

We cannot, however, concur in the view he takes, of the system recently adopted of enlarging farms in Ireland, having been the cause “of reducing the peasants to a more unhappy condition than any other mode of cultivation, by taking the direction of labour out of their hands.” It was long a common mistake to suppose that large farms depopulated a country, but that notion has been refuted; and it has, on the contrary, been ascertained, by actual enumeration, that many more hands are in fact employed in Scotland since the farms were enlarged,—and employment of the people is what we contend for. It is certainly true, when applied to store farms in mountain districts, where only few hands are employed, as pasturage is necessarily of a peculiarly depopulating nature; but the consolidation of

farms has quite a different effect, and is far from being detrimental either to landlord or tenant.

Irish landlords (as a class, perhaps the worst in the world), generally regardless of any other consideration, than that of drawing the maximum of rent from the minimum of land, favouring any project which might gratify their short-sighted cupidity, have converted large tracts of tillage land into pasture, which system throws the country back; for as cattle spread, men disappear, and consumers and commerce with them, and thus the value of land eventually falls.

There is, according to Mr. Bryan, "a most ample and beneficial field for the employment of the people upon the western coast of Ireland, where there are few or no quays to land goods, and the navigation of the large rivers is impeded by bars, the tributary streams submerging large quantities of land."

"The lowest elevation of waste (improvable) land is 203 feet above the level of the sea at low water: their best manure, limestone gravel, lies in central hills, with every facility to improvement by water carriage.

"The chemical decomposition of peat soils is now well understood, so that, to use the language of Mr. Aiken and Sir H. Davy, such soils may become masses of manure; and there are strong grounds for belief, the latter philosopher declares, that any capital so expended, would, in a very few years, afford a great and increasing interest, and contribute to the wealth and prosperity of the kingdom at large."

"The bogs of Ireland (says Young) differ from the boggy, mossy, and fenny lands of England, with regard to the facility of reclaiming; and still more so in point of value. A vast proportion of the unreclaimed land of Ireland is undoubtedly productive; and nature has been so bountiful, that little skill and a small expense will do (according to Newenham); while in most other countries the natural manures are scanty, in Ireland they are almost every where to be found in the greatest abundance and perfection.

"The peat soil in the south of Holland, which formerly resembled the bog land of Ireland, is now the garden of Europe.

"If the proprietors of waste lands in Ireland will come fairly forward, give the people long leases, and let them at a fair rent, proportionate to their yearly produce, so that each party would have a mutual interest in their improvement, as is the case with Italy and the south of France, and allow also a pecuniary expenditure of three pounds an acre, the people will willingly give their present *waste labour* without any charge, in expectation of future independence. We may be asked, what is there to support the peasants while thus employed? The same means that support many of them now through nearly five months of idleness in the year."—*Practical View*, p. 244-6.

Since the work from which we have made the preceding extracts was published, a vast number of farmers and peasants

in the county of Waterford have cheerfully given their "waste labour" to the pious and industrious Trappists, who found an asylum about five years ago on Sir Richard Keane's estate, when driven from France; and those "idle drones, those lazy monks," have converted a farm of six hundred acres of barren moorland and useless bog, into verdant meadows, affording pasture to numerous herds of cattle and flocks of sheep, and into well cultivated fields, bearing luxurious crops of grain—besides promoting a spirit of improvement and habit of industry, until then unknown, around their well-built monastic residence, adorned with a chapel "large enough (Ingليس says) to hold a dozen modern Irish Protestant churches within it." The example of this interesting colony will, we hope, ere long be followed in other parts of Ireland, in a moral, religious, industrious, and economical point of view, for in every one of them it is well worthy of imitation.

The Commissioners, in their reports on the bog and mountain districts in Ireland, give accounts of many successful attempts to reclaim peat soil, most of which, in the course of three years, generally repay the original outlay. We make the following extract from a Treasury minute now before us, dated 31st January 1831, printed by order of Parliament in 1832, recommending the attention of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests to the cultivation of crown lands in Ireland, by way of experiment, and we are enabled to state, from personal observations, that a considerable tract of those lands—Pobble o'Keefe (now called King William's town), near the source of the river Blackwater, on the confines of the counties of Cork and Kerry—has been brought into cultivation, and upwards of four hundred acres of bog land have been reclaimed, and now yield an ample return for all the expenditure. Land not worth a shilling an acre in its former state, is now worth twenty shillings. A new line of road passes through the crown estate; and we trust that the admirable example set by Lord Duncannon (for to him the merit of this truly national work is due), will not be lost on other Irish proprietors. The old rent of the crown lands of Pobble o'Keefe (3000 acres) was £30—about 2½d. an acre.—

"Viewing this subject in relation to the general interests of the country, the preservation of the peace, the relations of landlord and tenant, and the extension of wealth, your committee, though they depart reluctantly from what they consider a general principle, venture to recommend a trial of one or two experiments, on a limited scale, at the public expense.

"My Lords, consider that this interposition of the Crown may at once afford an example, and give a stimulus to the landed proprietors of Ireland, as well as bring to the test of experiment the various pro-

positions of parliamentary commissioners and committees, which recommend, as an object of the highest national importance, the reclamation of the waste lands of Ireland, ascertained to exceed in area *five millions of acres.*"

According to official documents, of those waste lands, the county of Kerry contains 150,000 statute acres, which might be reclaimed at an estimated expense of £107,950. King's and Queen's Counties contain about 100,000 acres,—Galway, Mayo, and Roscommon, 375,000 acres of bogs,—all of which might be converted into arable land, at an estimated expense little exceeding a guinea an acre, although, where the bog is deep, the fencing and draining would be much more expensive. Here is ample field for the employment of capital and labour, the latter over-abundant in Ireland!

Mr. Weale, who was dispatched to investigate the practicability of the projected experiment, observes in his report, March 1831:—

"Until then, the country situated to the south-east of Limerick was known to me only historically, as the theatre of desolating warfare in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and James I, as the refuge of outlaws in the reign of King William and Queen Anne, and as the scene of the recent insurrection under the pseudonymous banner of Captain Rock. I could scarcely credit the evidence of my senses, that such extensive tracts of land, presenting a variety of fertile soils, and combining many other natural advantages, which were obviously capable of contributing largely to the wealth and prosperity of the nation, had not participated in the general improvement of the country—and remained neglected by the hand of civilization from the period at which its ancient proprietors, the last Earls of Desmond, had been dispossessed of it.

"Viewing the capabilities of the crown estate, I became strongly impressed with an opinion, that the Commissioners would feel, that considerations of a higher nature than those which usually govern them in the management of the revenues placed under their charge, ought to influence their decision on the ultimate disposition of that property.

"This large district of country contains but two small villages, and only two resident proprietors, the distance between whose houses is thirty-eight British miles! It chiefly belongs to absentee proprietors, which, combined with the want of roads, and the turbulence of the people, have been the cause of its neglected state."

The banks of the same river—the Blackwater—within twenty miles from that picture of desolation and depopulation, so ably delineated in Mr. Weale's report in 1831, present a very different and much more pleasing aspect in 1837, according to the report of a Government engineer employed to fix the boundaries of the Irish boroughs. He says—

"In the neighbourhood of Mallow, there are sixty-three country residences, all occupied by families of the first respectability, within a circuit of not more than seven miles."

And there is no reason why a similar picture of rural prosperity should not be exhibited in almost every district of Ireland, with the boundless capabilities presented by fertile land, noble rivers, capacious bays, safe harbours, rich mineral treasures, and a coast presenting the finest resources for the employment of hardy and skilful fishermen.

There is no *physical* obstacle to prevent the developement of the many natural advantages Ireland possesses in a supereminent degree, independent of her peculiarly happy geographical position, so well adapted for commercial intercourse with Europe and America, now that tranquillity is restored, and the assize judges have nearly a sinecure; all that is wanting to render this fine country the abode of industry, is a continuance of good government, in order that the beneficial measures which the present liberal ministers are about to introduce, and sincerely desirous of carrying into effect, may not be frustrated by the machinations of an anti-national faction, abetted by the irresponsible branch of the legislature.

The system of thwarting every project which tended in any degree to benefit Ireland, by improving its agriculture, commerce, or navigation, seems habitual to the "Upper House," as it is termed by courtesy. Mr. Bryan, from whose book we have already made several quotations, states:—

"In 1828, I contributed my humble assistance towards drawing up a drainage and enclosure bill for Ireland, in conjunction with the patriotic member for Armagh, Mr. Brownlow, and Mr. Nimmo, the civil engineer.

"We had several great objects in view in that bill. First, to compel co-operation in the drainage of the country, for public sewers are as requisite as public roads, and all who are benefited thereby should contribute. We would also have extended inland navigation by its arrangement. Secondly, we sought by it to ascertain the boundaries of the respective proprietors of waste lands, at present but ill-defined. Thirdly, in case of the sale of those lands, we gave a secure or parliamentary title to the purchaser.

"This bill passed the Commons, and was twice read in the Lords; a member of the Duke of Wellington's administration then stated, that it required some amendments, but did not condescend to bring them forward. The result has been, that this peer has had the merit of depriving many starving families of the means of procuring an honest subsistence."—*Practical View*, p. 251.

The drainage act of 1st and 2d William IV, has been found inadequate to meet the exigencies of the country. Mr. Lynch's

bills, whose object was greatly similar to those Mr. Bryan alludes to (as having been defeated by a noble member of the Tory government of that day), will, we trust, be again brought forward in the next session of parliament, and prove more effectual. The Marquis of Clanricarde also introduced a bill in the House of Lords, the purport of which (we are unacquainted with its details) was of the same nature, though less comprehensive than either of the others. Let us hope it may meet with a better fate; we trust, at all events, if any noble lord thinks it would be improved by amendments, he may "condescend to bring them forward."

The Irish people are no longer to be trifled with, to suit the caprice of any man, or set of men. What the peasantry want is, first, exemption from oppression; secondly, work; and finally, a fair remuneration for their labour; and it is hard to deny an industriously inclined peasant *leave* to cultivate his native soil. We do not mean merely labour in public works, undertaken only for the purpose of affording temporary employment, which is bad on principle; for, in Ireland, the money thus laid out would find its way into the pockets of the landlords, who would contrive to raise their rents at the public expense; although national advantage may result, whenever money is not taken from private, and perhaps beneficial, employment, to be invested in some other purpose, which offers little or no chance of turning out productive.

"Mr. Nimmo expended £167,000 in Connaught alone in seven years; the increase of the annual revenue to government, in consequence, has since been equal to the whole of the expenditure. Mr. Griffiths, another engineer, in the Cork district, expended £60,000 in the same space of time; and the increase to Government revenue, in customs and excise, in the district, has been £50,000 a-year, which is to be attributed mainly to the increased facility of communication, by which the whole districts have been rendered available for productive purposes."—*Practical View*, p. 219.

We have procured Mr. Griffiths' report, printed by order of the House of Commons in April 1832, from which we select an interesting account of a long-neglected district on the confines of Cork and Kerry, the theatre of the Whiteboy insurrection in 1821, now intersected by a new line of road, extending to seventy-five English miles.

"At the commencement of the works, the people flocked to them from all quarters, seeking employment at any rate which might be offered: their general appearance bespoke extreme poverty, their looks were haggard, and their clothing wretched: they rarely possessed any tools, or implements of husbandry, beyond a very small ill-made spade,

and the whole face of the country was in a state of nature. But since the completion of the roads, rapid strides have been made towards cultivation and improvement.

"Upwards of sixty lime kilns, besides houses of a better class, have been built; carts, ploughs, and harrows of superior construction, and other agricultural implements, have become common; new enclosures of mountain farms are being made; and this country, which, within the last seven years, was the theatre of lawless outrage, has become perfectly tranquil, and exhibits a scene of industry and exertion at once pleasing and remarkable.

"To the credit of the inhabitants, I must say, that a large proportion of the money received by them for labour on the roads, has been husbanded with care, and subsequently laid out in building substantial houses, and in the purchase of cattle and implements of husbandry.

"I have not been able to ascertain on what grounds the intended improvements (connecting the new roads with others to be formed through the crown estates) were relinquished. There remains a considerable portion, extending northwards from the river Blackwater to a line drawn between the towns of Castle Island and Newmarket, comprehending an area of about two hundred square miles, or 128,000 acres, in which there is no road passable for horsemen during the winter months."

Much progress has been made in opening new lines of road, railways, and communications by land and water, throughout Ireland, since the date of Mr. Griffiths' report, by which an extensive field for the employment of the people is afforded, with a prospect of yielding beneficial returns to private speculators who have undertaken some of these enterprises.

Road-making has likewise occupied the attention of the grand juries, and, since the new act, they evince a willingness to co-operate with the government in carrying improvements into effect, very different from the adverse local influences which prevailed under the old "jobbing" system, happily extinct.—The Inland Navigation Company has been productive of great benefit—facilitating commercial intercourse, particularly on that noble river the Shannon, and the canals which connect it with the capital.

We were somewhat surprised, in looking over Mr. M'Culloch's "Statistical Account of the British Empire," published *last year*, to find that he represents Ireland not as it is at present, but as it was during the *last century*. Even his geological information, as to the localities where limestone prevails, is, in some respects, incorrect; and, instead of giving a true account of the actual state of Irish agriculture, his materials are drawn from sources, which, however valuable twenty or fifty years ago, are now obsolete, such as Arthur Young, C. Curwen, and Gilbert Wake-

field! Mr. McCulloch describes Ireland, such as it was under the horrors of penal laws and insurrections, the fertile fruit of Orange-Tory despotism, which carried its withering influence from the castle to the hovel; but now, thank God, a new era has commenced,—for, in the emphatic language of the first commoner of the empire, “a complete transfer of power from a faction to a nation has taken place in Ireland,” and its abundant natural capabilities, by getting free scope, are rapidly developing themselves, while abuses are daily being eradicated. Good roads are opening access to the most remote districts; and places which, at the beginning of the present century, were mere villages, are become handsome thriving towns, possessing a large export trade, with banking and commercial establishments on a scale commensurate with their rising importance.

The laborious statist, whose works we refer to, has no doubt a difficult task to perform; having such a mass of facts to collect, he must employ contributors, who copy from others; and allege that the estimates furnished by government engineers of the expense of draining bogs, and improving waste lands, are altogether hypothetical, and entitled to no weight, as no bogs have been drained, nor any land brought into profitable cultivation. And this statement is made, with the official report of Lord Headley's Kerry estate, published by Parliament, and the experiment successfully tried on the Crown lands at Pobble O'Keefe, open to his inspection, and that of the public at large, by means of parliamentary documents.

That Ireland is still in a backward state, compared to what she might have been, if heretofore under good government, is undeniable; but that the condition of the people is nearly as much depressed at this moment, as at any former period, is a great mistake on the part of the compiler of the “Statistical Account.” Wages have risen materially, while provisions are cheaper; labour on public and private works is more abundant; the people are better clothed and fed; their children are better educated, and a million and half sterling has been invested in the saving-banks! With these facts before one's eyes, it is impossible to doubt the growing prosperity of the country.

The produce of the land—a better system of husbandry having been generally introduced, and a vast portion of bog reclaimed—has increased from thirty to forty-fold in the course of a century; the population has quadrupled within the same time; and after supplying their own consumption, they are enabled to export between two and three million quarters of grain to England annually. A hundred years ago, the whole export of Ireland did not exceed 30,000 quarters of corn; tillage must have im-

proved to enable an increasing population to effect this phenomenon. The exports of cattle, sheep, and pigs, from Ireland to the port of Liverpool alone, in the course of the first six months of the present year, exceed 900,000*l.* in value; the facilities afforded by steam navigation having opened a new mine of wealth to all parts of the kingdom.

We have attributed much of the still existing misery to bad landlords, but there are, fortunately, exceptions even among absentees. We need not recapitulate what Mr. Inglis has said regarding some public-spirited English proprietors, and the improvements making on their estates; though it may be remarked, that these noble landlords, who are setting so philanthropic an example, are, almost without an exception, liberals in politics.

Intelligent agents, and skillful practical men as land-stewards, are essential to the amelioration of the estates of absentees, (which comprehend so large a portion of the surface of Ireland) and evidences of both are generally apparent. Green crops, not merely the potatoe as of old, are everywhere becoming more prevalent, though it is difficult to eradicate ancient habits, even to substitute more profitable ones. The peasantry are now no longer guilty of the barbarism of pulling out vetches, houghing cattle, and digging up pasture-land by night. Any candid observer must acknowledge, that a marked improvement has taken place in the moral and physical condition of the bulk of the Irish people; it only requires time and a continuance of impartial local government, to raise the frame-work of society to the level of that of England. In point of intelligence, the Irish have already the advantage over the English peasantry; as regards education, they are on a par, though perhaps inferior to the Scotch in the latter particular.

To show what landlords, who know their own interests, may *effect*, and how easy it is to manage even the rudest and most ignorant boor by adopting kind and conciliatory measures, we insert the following extract from "Hints to Irish Landlords," by Mr. Wiggins, an English practical agriculturist, published some years ago, abridging it as we have been obliged to do other documents.

"Lord Headly's estate of Glenbeg, situated in a wild district of Kerry, at the entrance of the Iveragh Mountains, consisting of 15,000 acres, much of which is rocky, boggy, and mountain ground, was, in 1807, inhabited by a people, to whom the bare idea of labour was offensive, and work considered as slavery, though a robust, active, enterprising, and hospitable race of peasantry.

"Lord Headly resolved to cultivate their good qualities, without being at first very eager to punish their bad ones, and has succeeded in introducing a degree of improvement and cultivation, which without

these effects, must have required a century. They are now well clothed, and as orderly and well-conducted as you see in any village in England. Agriculture has improved with very little sacrifice of rent or money.

"The system pursued by Lord Headly is perfectly applicable to any part of Ireland. There was an application of land to a bog (peat) surface, and it was let at 4*l.* an acre the year after it was reclaimed.

"No country requires so much drainage as Ireland; there the means of employing the people, in reclaiming bog and mountain land, and making roads, is generally to be found.

"I consider the *best capital of Ireland to be the industry of the people*: my mode of setting it a-going, would be by the introduction of a plan, having the effect of compelling labour, as I conceive the Poor-Laws of England have. Persons would not be willing to feed the poor, and clothe and lodge them, without having the benefit of their labour in return, and I think this labour would return its expense four-fold."

In the Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, dated March 1837, they enumerate the beneficial results of their application of parliamentary grants, and loans of exchequer bills, in advancing the various national works now in progress, and their advantageous effect on the lower classes of the people.

"In the course of last summer, distress prevailed in the county of Donegal. His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant was pleased to appropriate a sum of money to the purchase of meal and potatoes, to be applied for the relief of the inhabitants, by paying them in provisions for their labour, applied to the construction of roads in that wild and uncultivated district. Thirteen miles of roads were made and repaired by their dispensation of meal, &c.; the computed value of which, was something under 650*l.*, and relief was afforded (including gratuitous assistance to the sick and helpless) to nearly 40,000 persons. * *

"It is not true, as it has been sometimes asserted, that the want of energy of the labourer in some parts of the interior of Ireland, arises from a natural defect of character, that inclines him, like the sloth, to labour only to the extent necessary to procure the most wretched diet, with which he is satisfied.

"The result of society in Ireland may lead a cursory observer to that conclusion, for it too often happens that the peasant is reduced in circumstances, to the extent of being burdened with a heavy debt, in the shape of arrears for rent, which cannot by possibility be paid from the profits of his small holding; the consequence is, that any extra exertion would be thrown away, so far as his own personal advantage is concerned, and therefore inactivity arises. But when roused, by fair opportunities being laid before them and explained, we find that those who can profit by them, are perfectly willing to do so. Nor can we doubt, that by a more general introduction of such opportunities, the Irish labourers will become fully equal to the same class in England, and for the same remuneration will do the same quantity of work. We deem it, however, bad policy to put them off with inferior

remuneration; the labourer is degraded by too low wages, while the employer himself obtains very little advantage.

"We have, with these views, and to give a fair trial to different modes of proceeding, in some instances, formed establishments, and carried on the works by day-labour, and small contracts, which have led to more satisfaction to the workmen, and improved their condition, as well as the moral feeling with regard to employment, and to a much better understanding of improved mechanical means, and their application."

The three extracts we have given from such respectable and authentic sources, fully substantiate the favourable view we have taken of the excellent qualities and dispositions of the Irish peasantry, independent of the great public principle now involved, in treating them with impartial justice. Surely the experiment is worth trying; harsh and coercive measures we know, by long and dear-bought experience, having signally failed. Let the great and still undeveloped resources of the country—now tranquil and free from crime, because well governed—be called into action, by kind treatment of a hardy and patient population; whose cheerful labour, it would be better policy to avail ourselves of at home, than to compel them to banish themselves to a foreign clime—the United States, the wilds of Canada, or the remote Australia, in order to earn a precarious livelihood, while they are *entitled* to subsistence in the land of their birth. It need not be added, that the emigration part of the proposed poor-law scheme, is not that which we most admire, nor do we deem it necessary.

The subject, however, is too important to be dismissed in a summary manner, such as our space demands; it requires ample discussion, and merits no small portion of public attention when brought before the legislature.

Ireland, with her productive soil, genial climate, and vast capabilities, might be a happy country, and occupy an elevated position among nations, if those who have so long enjoyed a monopoly of all employments, commands, and dignities, "even that of the priesthood," like the *populum regem*, would lay aside their prejudices, banish their ignorant horror of popery, and hold out the hand of good-fellowship to their less fortunate countrymen; evincing their sincerity by ceasing to oppose the introduction of those reforms, which, under the auspices of our young and beloved sovereign, must be conceded. Then Ireland would truly become what she has hitherto been only poetically,

"Great, glorious, and free,

First flower of the earth, first gem of the sea."

ART. VII.—1. *Letters from an Irish Protestant to the People of Scotland.* 1836.

2. *Blackwood's Magazine.*

IN a former article,* it was shown that various editions of the Scriptures had appeared in the respective tongues of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands, previous to Luther's German version, which, by a singular ignorance or dissimulation of the fact, is usually viewed as the first vernacular translation of the Bible, and, as such, the parent and source of the Reformation. But in that article, not less than fifty distinct impressions, in the native dialects of Europe, are indicated; and though some rather represented the history than the text of Scripture, a more accurate research will demonstrate that the existing literal versions of the Bible in 1534, when Luther completed his, even exceeded that number.† And if we consider all the circumstances of the period; the comparatively few who could read; the high prices of books under the difficulties of an infant art; the nearly two hundred successive editions of the *Latin Vulgate*, almost equally accessible to persons of education, who alone could read, and the great majority of whom were ecclesiastics, it will be found that every rational want was fully provided for. The supply was adequate to the demand, and if the increased publications, immediately consequent on the Reformation, be urged in contradiction, we may authorizedly answer, that an interested and artificial cry was then raised, as it is at the present hour, when we know that millions of Bibles have been circulated without the requisition, or we apprehend, the benefit, of the people among whom they have been distributed.‡ At all events, they were not the novelties, or sealed volumes,

* No. II. Art. IV.

† The edition of Wittenberg, in 1541, contains his last revision of the text. His own copy, with his autograph, and those of Melancthon, Bugenhagen, and others, was sold at Mr. Hibbert's sale, in 1829, (No. 8724) for £267. 15s., and purchased for the British Museum. Luther's New Testament had appeared in September 1522; (Ebert Allgemeines bibliographisches Lexicon, No. 2266) and other detached portions in succession; but the whole, or as the Protestants require, the *unmutilated* Bible, not till 1534.—*Horne's Appendix.*

‡ Thousands of these Bibles are pawned immediately on receipt, and unread, as their virgin state in the pawnbrokers' windows will show; pretty much like that in the library at Worlingham, in Suffolk, which belonged to Charles II, and in which was written—

“Hark! ye, my friends, that on this Bible look,
Marvel not at the fairness of the book;
No soil of fingers, nor such ugly things,
Expect to find, Sirs! for it was the king's.”

Dibdin's Library Companion, p. 34.

that historians, with the most discreditable carelessness of inquiry and hardihood of assertion, have represented them. Robertson, (*Charles V.*, vol. ii. p. 205, in 4to.) it would seem, was either ignorant, or wilfully suppressed the mention, of any translation prior to Luther's, which he describes as pregnant with marvellous discoveries and effects; nor do our other writers appear better informed, or more candid.

It will be seen, on the other hand, as we proceed, that it was almost solely in those countries which have remained constant to the Catholic faith, that these popular versions had been published; so little did they prepare the way for, or promote the innovation; while it was precisely in those kingdoms, England, Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, where Protestantism acquired an early, and has maintained a permanent, ascendancy, that no Bible existed before they embraced the new creed. We mean, of course, printed translations; for the cost and paucity of manuscripts placed them wholly beyond common reach or effect, though it was exclusively to Catholics that the preservation of manuscripts, and through them of the divine word, is due, as we have heard the illustrious Cuvier emphatically declare, and gratefully acknowledge, in his luminous review of the origin and progress of science, preliminary to his last course of public lectures.

Those who exclaim against the scanty supply, as alleged, of Bibles before the Reformation, entirely overlook the important consideration, that it was first necessary the people should read, a faculty rare indeed, because of difficult exercise and uncertain use, previous, and for some time subsequent to, the invention of printing. In the fourteenth century, Bertrand du Guesclin, "le plus grand guerrier," says his biographer, "de son siècle, ne sut jamais lire ni écrire, à l'exemple de tous les nobles de cette époque;" and two hundred years after, we find another Constable of France, Anne de Montmorency, the undisputed head of the French nobility, equally illiterate. Charlemagne, at an anterior period, did not learn to write until advanced in years, nor then with much success; "sed parum prospere successit, præposterus et sero inchoatus," are the words of his secretary. (*Gibbon*, vol. v. 140, 4to. ed.) Our own statute-book, likewise affords sufficient proof of the fewness of readers, in the exemption from punishment, or arrest of judgment after conviction, granted to criminals capable of reading—an act not formally repealed till 1706. (*Blackstone*, book iv. ch. 28.) Persons of the highest station, as our public records show, were *marksmen*, a word, we may observe, not to be found with that construction in the early editions of *Johnson's Dictionary*, but Mr. Todd has

illustrated its application by an appropriate reference. The original Solemn League and Covenant, (see *Dalrymple's Memoirs of Great Britain*, vol. ii. p. 25; *Hume*, vi. 595, and *Lingard*, x. 51) now deposited in the British Museum, exhibits an abundance of marksmen, all of whom, from the horror of Popery then entertained, have left the cross unfinished, and signed in the shape of the letter T. (*Nicholson and Burns' History of Cumberland*, p. 324.) Shakspeare's father, though chief alderman of Stratford, could not write; (*Skottowe's Life of Shakspeare*, 1824) nor could the trustees of his marriage-contract with Anne Hathway, in 1582, otherwise most respectable citizens.*

Numberless proofs exist of the high prices of books before the discovery of printing. Ames, in his *History of the English Press*, (Lond. 1749, 4to.) says, "I have a folio manuscript in French, called *Roman de la Rose*, on the last leaf of which is wrote, 'Cest lyver costa au palais de Paris quarante couronnes d'or sans mentyr.'" (*Dibdin's Typogr. Antiq.* vol. i. p. 11.) This sum is valued by Ames at £33. 6s. 8d. British; but it is considerably more. M. Petit Radet, (*Recherches sur les Bibliothèques*, Paris, 1819, 8vo.) writes, "Au treizième siècle, le prix moyen des livres, non surchargés d'ornemens, était de quatre à cinq cents francs d'aujourd'hui." The common price of a missal was five marks, equal to the yearly revenue of a vicar or curate, (*Townley's Illustrations of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii. p. 82) and Chevillier, the Parisian printer, in his *Histoire de l'Imprimerie*, (Paris, 1694, 4to.) says, that Louis XI was obliged to pledge a quantity of plate, in addition to the joint bond of a nobleman, as security for the loan of a translation of the Arabic Physician, *Rhasis*. The immediate reduction of prices produced by the great discovery, and which exposed Fust, (probably the origin of Dr. *Faustus*) to the imputation of sorcery, on the cheap sale of his great Bible of 1462, at Paris, appears, from a letter or address to Pope Paul II, prefixed to the Bishop of Alerio's edition of the

* That Shakspeare's father was a Catholic, is conclusive, from the invocation of the Virgin, &c., in his Will; nor is there any thing in the poet's own works to show that he was not one himself. Several passages would rather prove that he was; such as, "I am thy father's spirit," &c., in *Hamlet*, (Act i. Scene 5), in commenting on which, Mr. Whalley (Johnson and Stevens' edition, 1793) says, "that Shakspeare speaks more like a Catholic than a Platonist." His contemporary, Massinger, according to his editor, Mr. Gifford, (1813, 4 vols. 8vo.) was a Catholic. The invocation of Saints, prelude to wills, even extends to the private letters of the Oriental Christians; and it is difficult to repress a smile, at the result of good Bishop Heber's efforts to exhibit to the Patriarchs, or *Mars* of the Eastern Churches, the errors of Popery, and rally them to his side; but their answers, uniformly commencing with the invocation of "Our Lady, the pure Mary, and the host of Martyrs and Saints," may indicate the measure of his success.—Appendix to his Journal, vol. ii. 467, 4to.

Epistles of St. Jerome in 1468, to have been four-fifths. "What used to cost one hundred crowns, fell to twenty;" and, of course, a gradual decline to a greater extent followed the progress of the art. The consequent advantage to poor students, is thus quaintly described by Jean Molinet, a contemporary poet, whose works accompany the poems of his predecessor, Froissart, in Mr. Buchan's late edition of that renowned chronicler (Paris, 1829):

"J'ai veu grant multitude
De livres imprimés,
Pour tenir en estude
Pauvres mal argentés.
Par ces nouvelles modes,
Aura maint escollier
Décret, Bible et Code,
Sans grant argent bailler."

Accordingly, we learn from Maittaire, (*Annal. Typogr.* pars ii. p. 472) that, in 1547, Robert Stephens sold his quarto Hebrew Bible, (4 vols. 1539-1544) at sixty to one hundred sols, (*solidi*) and his beautiful small edition, (8 vols. 16mo. 1544-1546) for forty-five sols; while the price of his New Testaments, (*O Mirificum*) 1546 and 1549, in 12mo. was six sols each. The cost of beef, at that time, was about one halfpenny, or sol, the pound, (*Chronicon Preciosum*, p. 162) so that the sol was nearly equivalent to the modern franc. See also T. Wharton's *History of English Poetry*, Second Dissertation.

The early translations to which we have adverted, had, for their model, the Latin of St. Jerome, which, in truth, nearly superseded their use, for it was intelligible to most readers; the few who possessed that advantage being generally churchmen, and those who were not, would naturally prefer a fixed idiom (one that opened, likewise, to their enjoyment, the treasures of antiquity) to the barbarous and unsettled jargon, then, with the exception of Italy, almost every where spoken or written. We are quite aware that the language of the *Vulgate* is not classical, nor surely is that of the original Gospels; but it is unvarying, and, in its homeliness, not without attraction, such as the *Imitation of Christ* offers, which few, we are confident, would exchange for the most exquisite Latinity; "Le livre le plus beau," as characterized by Fontenelle, "qui soit parti de la main d'un homme, puisque l'évangile n'en vient pas."* The attempt

* In Fontenelle's life of his uncle, *le Grand Corneille*, quoted by Tachereau, (vie de Pierre Corneille, 1827, p. 180) Corneille translated the *Imitation* into verse, (Paris, 1651-1656, 4to.) more to the credit of his piety than his taste. The Greek version, by the Jesuit G. Mayer, was reprinted very neatly in 1824, by Didot, at Paris, 12mo. It is very literal, and simple in style, as the original. No book, except the Bible,

of Sebastian Castalio to transfuse the sacred text into Ciceronian Latin, has been justly derided for its affectation, though not without its partizans in England. For *angelus*, he substitutes *genius*; for *baptismo*, *lotio*; *respublica* supplies *ecclesia*, and *collegium* replaces *synagoga*. It was published at Basil, 1551, in folio, and followed by his French version in 1557, which, on the other hand, is disgraced by the most ignoble diction, even for that period. In Psalm lxxviii, where our English authorized version has, "He chose David for his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds," this reformer, or as the Jesuit, Frs. Garasse, (*Doctrine Curieuse*, &c., Paris, 1623, p. 203, 4to.) calls him, "ce vrai porcher," renders it, "il le tira du cul d'une charrie;" and "Mercy rejoiceth against judgment," (*Epist. St. James*, c. ii. v. 13) he makes, "la miséricorde fait la figue au jugement;" thus exemplifying, it must be granted, the *traduttore e traditore* of the Italians.

Various other Latin translations by Protestants have sunk into oblivion; but the Vulgate has constantly risen in the estimation of the learned. The Rev. Mr. Horne, in his *Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures*, vol. ii. p. 239, cites the authority of Richard Simon, the learned oratorian, to show, "that the more ancient the Greek manuscripts and other versions are, the more closely do they agree with the Vulgate, which has, in consequence, been more justly appreciated." (R. Simon, *Histoire Critique*, &c. Rotterd. 1688, 4to.) And, adds Mr. Horne, whose testimony in this respect must carry especial weight, "the Latin Vulgate preserves many true readings, where the modern Hebrew copies are corrupt." All the more recent German critics, who will hardly be arraigned of partiality, ascribe the highest value to this venerable translation, which Bacon, it has been observed, always preferably uses even in his English works, but to which his countrymen long refused all merit, pretty much for the same reason that induced them, during 170 years, (1582-1752,) to reject the reformed calendar, merely because it emanated from Rome. This supposed impurity of source was deemed a justifying motive; and yet England accepted the Reformation from Henry, as Denmark did from Christiern, two of the greatest monsters that ever disgraced, not only the throne, but human nature. Lord Chesterfield's letter to his son of 7th April 1751, when the reformed calendar was under legislative discussion, deserves perusal; nor ought it to

has been so often printed as this volume, whose authorship seems yet undetermined, notwithstanding the numerous claimants to its composition, in Italy, France, and Belgium. Were we to hazard an opinion, it would be in favour of Gerson, Chancellor of the University of Paris, as Bossuet also thought.

escape animadversion, that such men as Newton and Napier should suffer the gross astronomical error to pass unrebuked, rather than avow an obligation to Rome; but the darkest prejudice overshadowed their reason, as the commentaries of both on the Apocalypse sufficiently evince.

A fundamental rule of the Bible Society prescribes the exclusive use of the authorized English version, without note or comment. This is a recognition of the principle, on which the Catholic Church assigns a similar prerogative of authenticity to the Latin Vulgate, and equally warrants the Catholic pastor in forbidding any other than the Douay translation, which, not only is not interdicted, but urgently recommended. The Rev. Dr. Harmer, (*Critica Sacra*, vol. ii. p. 82,) renders justice, in this respect, to the Catholic Church, and transcribes the pressing exhortation to the reading of the Bible in the French version of De Sacy. The authority of Pius VI, in his letter of 1st April, 1778, to Antonio Martini, afterwards Archbishop of Florence, on his excellent translation, (Turin, 1776-1781,) now uniformly precedes the Douay New Testament, as an incentive to its perusal.*

As for the "Bible without note or comment," it certainly was not the design of the translators appointed by James I, that the book should so circulate; for the heads of chapters are, all through, running, or rather leading commentaries on the text, as the slightest inspection will demonstrate. Indeed, common sense, not less than experience, will justify the indignant demand of Mr., now Lord, Stanley, directed, in March 1832, to some fervent biblicals in parliament, "whether, as parents, they could put the whole Bible into the hands of their children, without the superintendence of a religious instructor?" Yet, from his letter to Mr. Hodgson, in August 1836, a new light seems to have dawned on his lordship; but the curators of lunatic asylums can best elucidate the consequences of committing to the indiscriminate reader, and to capricious interpretation, a volume which unveils not its mysteries to intuitive ken or perception, and which levelled in impotent and humiliating prostration the most powerful of intellects.

It is doubtless proper, indeed indispensable, that the stamp of authenticity should distinguish one of the groundworks of

* Cardinal Beausset, ("Vie de Bossuet," tom. i. p. 209,) defines the motives of precaution in the Catholic Church against the attempt at translation, by every pretender or enthusiast—"Son véritable motif a été de prémunir les fidèles contre les interprétations fausses ou hasardées, que quelques novateurs osoient se permettre, pour propager leurs erreurs à l'ombre d'une autorité sacrée." And common sense will confirm this precaution. "Bossuet," adds the Cardinal, "était, en général, favorable aux traductions en langue vulgaire," &c. Ibid. p. 210.

our faith, and fix that text, so ostentatiously invoked by our opponents; for to it, the Catholic Church equally appeals, and in it, as its best expositor, has ever found her firmest support. The character of authenticity impressed by the Council of Trent on the Latin Vulgate, is clearly defined. (*Sessio* iv. 8vo. *Aprilis* 1546.) "Insuper eadem sacrosancta Synodus statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu, in ipsâ ecclesiâ probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus pro authenticâ habeatur." No reasonable person can object to this exposition, which is equivalent to the words prefixed, with the same view, to the English Bible—"By his Majesty's special command—Appointed to be read in Churches." And the Latin Vulgate offers the peculiar advantage of being the uniform standard of reference, in every portion of the earth where a Catholic exists.

"Far as the breeze can bear, the billow foam,
Survey our empire!"

The dedication of the English version to that "Sun in his strength, whom the heavenly hand of the Lord hath enriched with many singular graces, that he may be the wonder of the world, &c.," will show, how far the learned interpreters were imbued with the Holy Spirit whom they had invoked, when they addressed, in such terms, a monarch, the shame alike of royalty and of manhood. (See *Von Raumer's Beiträge zur neueren Geschichte aus Britische Museum. Erster Band*, 1836.) The chief merit of this translation is, unquestionably, in the idiomatic structure of its language; but it can bear no comparison, in accuracy of construction, with the Latin Vulgate. Without appealing to Ward's *Errata*, we have the admission of Louth, Newcombe, Wakefield, Bellamy, and numerous other English divines, that the errors are frequent, and a revision desirable, in which the Rev. Mr. Horne expresses his concurrence, (vol. ii. p. 78,) but, like the Ark of the Covenant, to touch it is profanation. The glaring blunders of the press, which have been found to pervade almost every edition, have been often animadverted on, as may be seen in Dr. Dibdin's *Library Companion*, Mr. Carey's tract, &c., and do little credit, indeed, to the supervisors of what is so emphatically proclaimed, *the pure word of God*—the archetype, too, of a great portion of those versions, which the Bible Society have sent forth for the propagation of truth.

The Protestants, on the other hand, long rung the changes on the variances of the Vulgate, and its successive emendations, until the final adjustment of the text by Clement VIII, in 1592

and 1593; but they have been most fully answered by Joseph Bianchini, a learned Father of the Oratory, in his *Vindiciæ Canoniarum Scripturarum Vulgatæ Editionis, Romæ 1740*, in folio, and by others—and it is our conviction, that if the learned world, including all persuasions, were now limited to the choice and possession of a single text of holy writ, as has been hypothetically proposed in regard to books on other subjects, the majority of collected suffrages would declare in favour of this Catholic authority, as the most genuine expression of the revealed will of Heaven. How incorrect that text is in the original languages, may be learned from the fact, that Dr. Kennicott found ten thousand various readings in the collation of about six hundred Hebrew manuscripts, though none, as he affirmed to his royal patron, George III, to affect any essential tenet of Christianity; and the gleanings of De Rossi, subsequent to the learned Doctor's labours, have not been inconsiderable. Nor have Wetstein, Griesbach, Alder, and others, been less successful in discovering an equal dissidence, proportionably to its extent, in the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, of which nearly seven hundred have been subjected to examination.

The earliest great effort of the master-art—the primogenial fruit of the press—was the Latin Vulgate, which appeared between the years 1450 and 1455, and is distinguished as the Mazarine Bible. It was fitting, indeed, that the sacred volume should receive the first homage of the mighty invention, best calculated to diffuse its light, and impart its blessings. A more appropriate tribute could not be offered, nor does a nobler monument remain of the power that produced it. It has been the object of admiration to every writer who has described the book, from Naudé to Dr. Dibdin, and it was followed in quick succession by about two hundred editions of the same text, before Luther achieved his German version. The Latin was, and long continued to be, the medium of communication and instruction. Four-fifths of published books were necessarily in that tongue, which was intelligible to an equal proportion of readers, to whom, therefore, these two hundred impressions were equivalent, in use, to the same number of vernacular editions.

On a former occasion,* however, it was shown, that no less than fifty versions, literal or historical, of the Bible, in the native idioms of Europe, had likewise preceded Luther's. But, in fact, they were more numerous, for several have been discovered since 1723, the date of Lelong's *Bibliographia Sacra*,

* No. II. Art. IV.

or its continuation by Masch, in 1778-1790, the authorities chiefly relied on in the article to which we allude. "Are you aware that the Bohemians had published seven editions of the Scriptures before Luther began his great German Bible?" writes Mr. John Strang, in his recent travels, (*Germany in 1831*, vol. ii. p. 204.) Of German Bibles, it is also ascertained, that the library purchased in 1784 by the Duke of Wirtemberg, at Copenhagen, of the Rev. Mr. Lork, contained not less than twenty-three editions prior to Luther's, and this number has since been increased by various acquisitions, amongst which was that of the laborious Panzer's collection. This bibliographer, in his *Annalen der Alten Deutschen Litteratur*, (Nuremberg 1788, and Supplement, 1802, in 4to.) reckoned eleven editions to which he could assign no distinct date, but which were not posterior to 1480, independently of others with specific dates; but our best authority, on the subject, is the work of Fred. Ad. Ebert, *Allgemeines Bibliographisches Lexicon*, printed at Leipsic, in successive parts, (1821-1830, two vols. 4to.) The author is royal librarian at Dresden, where he has under his charge 260,000 volumes. (*Essai Statistique sur les Bibliothèques*, par M. Balbi, Vienne, 1835, 8vo.)

The royal library of Stuttgart possesses, beyond doubt, the most extensive assemblage of Bibles ever formed. The foundation was laid in the purchase, to which we have alluded, of Mr. Lork's collection, of which the catalogue was published in 1787 at Hamburg, under the title of *Bibliotheca Wurtembergensium Ducis, olim Lorkiana, auctore J. G. Ch. Aldero*. The biblical articles amounted to 5155, and those obtained, at the decease of Panzer, to 1645. The duke, grandfather of the reigning King of Wirtemberg, had, indeed, commenced the library in its general departments, so early as 1768; and, in 1804, it consisted of above 100,000 volumes, which, in 1818, when visited by Dr. Dibdin, had increased to 130,000. Of these, 8,200 were Bibles, exclusive of duplicates; and, in 1835, M. Balbi estimated the whole collection at 174,000 printed, and 1800 manuscript volumes, the Bibles constituting from 9,000 to 10,000, and still requiring about 3000 to complete the collection. (*Dibdin's Tour*, vol. iii. p. 21. See also, *Versuch einer Beschreibung, &c.* by Fr. Gott. Hirsching, Erlang. 1786, and Balbi's *Essai Statistique sur les Bibliothèques*.) A version unheard of until late years, is the Spanish, or rather Catalonian, described by M. de la Serna Santander, (*Dictionnaire Bibliogr.* tom. ii. p. 197,) and printed, as the colophon states, at Valencia,—“A despeses de Alfonso Fernandez, comenzada en los mes de Febrer de l'any 1477, e acabada en los mes de Març de l'any

1478,"—thus, taking thirteen months to execute. The translator was Bonifacio Ferreiro; but we believe that, out of Spain, not a single copy exists.* We could indicate other recent discoveries of old translations in vulgar tongues, and some may, as yet, have escaped detection or notice.

In farther evidence of the solicitude of the Catholics to promote, rather than repress, the knowledge of the Scriptures, we refer to their strenuous exertions to disseminate the original texts, before the Protestants could claim an equal merit. So early as 1503, Cardinal Ximenes made preparations for publishing the magnificent Complutensian Polyglot, exhibiting the FIRST Christian edition of the Old Testament in Hebrew, (previously the work of Jews,) with the Chaldee paraphrase of the Pentateuch, and the FIRST IMPRESSIONS of the Septuagint and New Testament in Greek. The Old Testament was finished on the 10th July 1517, having been preceded by the New on the 10th January 1514—"In hac præclarissimâ Complutensi Universitate." To a Catholic university, therefore, and to a Spanish city, (Alcala de Henares,) is the Christian world indebted for this union of obligations.

In attributing the precedence of date to this Polyglot, we do not forget that the Septuagint was printed at the Aldine press at Venice in 1518,† and that the New Testament was edited by Erasmus at Basil in 1516, while we know that this Polyglot did not appear until 1520, or 1522, after the cardinal's death; but, as it was first printed, we assign it the priority, and, at all events, the whole of these primary editions emanated from Catholics. The Polyglot by Ximenes, and the New Testament by Erasmus, were inscribed to Leo X.

Mr. Pettigrew, in his catalogue of the library of the Duke of Sussex, cites a letter from Dr. Adam Clarke, on the merits of this great work, in which that learned person says—"I conclude that the Hebrew, Septuagint, Vulgate, Chaldee as far as it goes, and the original of the New Testament, are, as they stand in the Complutensian Polyglot, equal, in critical value, to manuscripts of these texts and versions of the tenth or twelfth centuries, or even higher." Lelong (*Biblioth. Sacra*, p. 11)

* The work of Gab. Diosdado Raym, "De primâ Typographiæ Hispanicæ Ætate," Romæ 1793, 4to.; and, "Typographia Española," by F. Mendez, Madrid, 1796, 4to. may be usefully consulted on early Spanish printing, a subject not incurious, though comparatively neglected.

† The elder Aldus died in 1515, but during the non-age of his sons, the establishment was conducted by their grandfather, Andrea Torresano, or Asulanus, whose daughter Aldus had married in 1500, and who printed this Septuagint.—(*Renouard Annales des Alde*, Paris, 1825.) An imperfect copy of the New Testament, by Erasmus, (1516) on vellum, sold at Sir Mark Sykes' sale for 140*l*.

makes them even coeval with the seventh or eighth centuries. On receiving from the printer the concluding volume, the Cardinal exclaimed—"Grates tibi ago, summe Christe, quod rem magnopere a me curatam ad optatum finem perduxeris;" and, addressing those around him, added, "Nihil est, amici, de quo magis gratulari mihi debeatis, quam de hac bibliorum editione, quæ una sacros religionis nostræ fontes, tempore perquam necessario, aperit." Six hundred copies, at the price of two and a half crowns of gold, constituted the edition, with three on vellum, one of which, bought in 1789, at the Pinelli sale, by Count M'Carthy of Toulouse, for £483,—the largest sum ever paid, up to that period, in England, for a set of books—was purchased at the Count's sale in 1817, for £644, by Mr. Hibbert; when Dr. Dibdin (*Library Companion*, p. 7) truly observed, that it was hardly possible to view these volumes, without feeling a justifiable pride, that they were the property of an Englishman. In our estimation, and under every combination of the elements of value, they constitute the most precious of existing books.*

To the first edition of the New Testament by Erasmus, in 1516, succeeded three others, in 1519, 1522, and 1527; and Daniel Bomberg, who printed the Hebrew Bible at Venice, both for Jews and Christians, had also published four editions, in 1517 (or 5278, Jewish chronology), 1521, 1525, and 1533, (that of 1528 being very dubious), before the first, by a Protestant,† Sebastian Munster, appeared in 1534-5. Again, in 1569-1572, a second Polyglot was edited at Antwerp, under the auspices of Philip II of Spain, prior to any similar enterprise on the part of Protestants; and the standard edition of the Septuagint has long been that of Rome, 1587—"ex auctoritate Sixti Quinti." The manuscript, which was its model, is now, we are happy to learn, under inspection for a new edition. Nor is Father Houbigant's Hebrew Bible (*Paris*, 1753, 4 vols. folio)

* See *Seb. Seemlerius, de Bibliis, Complutensibus Polyglottis*, Ingold. 1785, 4to. One of the ablest coadjutors of the Cardinal, was Stunica (Jacobus Lopez), a doctor of the University, whom Ximenes despatched to Rome in search of manuscripts, &c., of which journey he has left a rare volume—*Itinerarium, dum Compluto Romam proficisceretur*, in 4to. His altercations with Erasmus exposed him to the shafts of ridicule, not only of Erasmus, but of Ulrich Von Hütten, who assigned him a prominent place in the celebrated *Litteræ Obscurorum Virorum*. He died at Naples in 1530.

† Concerning these, and the earlier Jewish editions, in various cities of Italy, (Soncino, Ferrara, Brescia, Cremona, Naples, and Venice), the numerous publications of John Bernard de Rossi are the best authorities; more especially his *Annales Hebræo-typographici, seculi xv*, Parmæ, 1795-1799, 2 parts, 4to., and the Catalogue of his Library, *Libri stampati di Letteratura Ebraica*, &c., Parma, 1812, in 8vo. For Bomberg's editions, in particular, see *Annales Hebræo-typographici*, vol. ii. p. 28.

wholly eclipsed by the more recent one of Dr. Kennicott, notwithstanding the Rev. Mr. Horne's depreciation of the learned Oratorian's labours. In the *Bibliographical Appendix* to the second volume of his *Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*, p. 7, Mr. Horne asserts, "that Houbigant's edition has not answered the high expectations entertained of it," and refers, in evidence, to the *Bibliotheca Sussexiana*, p. 192-194; but these pages contain no mention of the work; and, when adverted to at pages 202-204, it is in terms of marked praise.—"This Bible is an invaluable treasure to every biblical reader," is the forcible expression used. Dr. Kennicott also affirms, that it claims for its worthy author the applause of all friends of religion and learning. Nor is Dr. Dibdin less laudatory, designating it "a splendid monument of individual labour and learning, and of corporate liberality; for the Fathers of the Oratory were at the expense of the publication." (*Classics*, vol. i. p. 79.) The edition was confined to five hundred copies, (Mr. Butler, *Horæ Biblicæ*, vol. i. p. 117, erroneously says, three hundred) which, independently of its intrinsic worth, has enhanced its price. The excellent prolegomena, prefaces, and notes, were separately published in 1777, 2 vols. 4to. at Frankfort, by Professor Bahrdt, (*Notæ Criticæ in Universos Veteris Testamenti libros, &c.*)

To this enumeration of the original texts of the Scriptures, we shall add a statement of the Bibles, or portions of the Bible, published between 1500 and 1536, extracted by the Rev. Mr. Townley from Panzer's *Annales Typographici*, (11 vols. 4to. *Norimb.* 1793-1803.) Within that interval, there appeared—1 Polyglot Bible (the Complutensian),—8 Hebrew, with 50 detached parts,—12 Greek Testaments, and 4 minor portions,—3 Old Testaments, and 3 Psalters, in Greek,—106 Latin Bibles, and 95 separate books of the Old Testament,—62 New Testaments, and 38 parts, in Latin,—15 Belgic Bibles, and 64 parts, (chiefly at Antwerp)—12 Italian Bibles, and 28 minor portions,—1 English Bible, 2 New Testaments, and 3 extracts from the Old,—2 New Testaments in Danish, and 7 parts,—the Evangelists in Hungarian, and the Psalter in Ethiopian; while 2 New Testaments, 1 Psalter, and 1 volume of the Penitential Psalms, constitute the whole of German contributions to the list, which certainly is an error. Altogether, the number of volumes amounts, Mr. Townley says, to 568 Bibles, or portions thereof. But there are considerable omissions: for Archbishop Newcombe, in his *View of the English Translations of the Bible*, pp. 387-411, makes the English publications, within that period, twenty-three; of which, however, one only was the whole Bible (Coverdale's). A comparison of Panzer, also, with *Ebert's Lexicon* (already noticed), will confirm the

remark of Brunet in his *Manuel du Libraire*,—"Cet ouvrage laisse encore beaucoup à désirer; surtout par rapport aux éditions de 1501 à 1536, dont il ne contient pas la moitié." If, notwithstanding, we add to Panzer's recital, the publications of the same character in the preceding period, 1450 (when, or near it, the Mazarine Bible was printed) to 1500, we shall have an accumulation of certainly not less than a thousand; and, of them, at least eight hundred preceded Luther's German Bible in 1534, which forms the era of Protestantism, in connexion and concurrence with the Bible. A thousand editions of that age were, probably, equal in expense to five thousand of the present day; for, as Mr. Townley observes—"the trade required large capitals; paper, and other materials, being exceedingly dear, and the readers but few." (vol. ii. p. 119.)

And we must observe, that not more than eighteen, of the five hundred and sixty-eight biblical articles, proceeded from England, Sweden, Denmark, or their dependencies, comprising all the Protestant monarchies of Europe, which certainly had become so without the aid of the Bible; for the solitary English volume did not appear until after the change of religion in England; and in 1536, no Bible existed in the other Protestant kingdoms. On the other hand, the four-fifths of these early scriptural productions issued from Italy, France, Belgium, and other parts, which have continued faithful to Catholicism;—a striking evidence that the Reformation extended not its influence where the light of Scripture had most beamed. By Catholics, then, we may confidently repeat, the sacred deposit was preserved during a succession of ages, amidst the ruins of time, the catastrophes of nature, and the assaults of men. By them its more enlarged circulation was promoted through the mighty agency of the press, of which it was the first mature production. By them, again, the original fountains of divine truth were opened to Christendom; and while the more educated were abundantly supplied with the bread of life in the language which they habitually read, the few readers, whose knowledge was confined to their native tongue, were not, as we have seen, unprovided for. And calumny has been our retribution! "*Quidam quo plus debent, magis oderunt.*"—(*Seneca, Epist. 19.*)*

* No stronger proof can be produced of bad passions, than the calumnies heaped on the Catholic Bishops of Ireland, in relation to *Peter Dens*, whose work, veiled in the obscurity of a learned language, as Gibbon said of the *Avékōōra* of Procopius, (vol. iv. 53), and, therefore, inaccessible to the great body of the people, even if injurious in its tenor, has been disseminated in partial versions, as if to produce the evil purpose, which was so shamelessly attributed to it. We could name various Protestant volumes, not more pure in subject or language, and by divines of known virtue; nor would it be difficult to indicate similar passages in Holy Writ which

Next to the inspired writers, and as their natural expounders, the holy Fathers claim our veneration. And here, it will be found, that either the first or the best editions, generally both, are due to Catholics; for every Latin father, without exception, and nearly all the Greek, reckon Catholics for their first publishers; and the Benedictine editions of both are, beyond all comparison, the most valued. We can appreciate the labours of Thirlby, Jebb, Potter, Mangey, Grabe, and some living German editors, which, however, no one will place on a parallel line with those of Montfaucon, Mabillon, Martianay, Ruinart, Thierry, Garnier, and other Benedictines, to whom we are indebted for the best editions of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Athanasius, Hilary, Cyril, Basil, John Chrysostom, with many minor collections, among the Greeks. And of the Latins, we owe to their zeal and industry, Ambrose, Jerome, Prosper, Augustin, Gregory, Cassiodorus, Bernard, &c. Amongst the other orders of the Church we could also select names associated, in the most eminent degree, with the propagation and elucidation of Holy Writ.

Having offered this series of facts, in vindication of the Catholic Church, from the imputation of hostility to the Bible, we shall endeavour to show, that the communication of the sacred volume to the people did not, as has been pretended, generate the Reformation; for, in nine-tenths of the European states, no popular version existed when they embraced Protestantism; and, unless effect in this case foreran cause, it could not have been the parent of its predecessor.

According to Malte-Brun,* a geographer of the highest authority, (*Universal Geography*, vol. vi. p. 79), the Catholic population of Europe embraces ninety-eight or ninety-nine millions—the Protestant, forty-three or forty-four, including all denominations. Lutheranism is professed in the two Saxonys, Wirtenberg, Hesse, and other provinces of Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Baltic provinces of Russia, and Prussia. Calvinism sways Western Germany, some cantons of Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland; while the Anglican Church is nearly confined to England; “but its oppression,” adds the Protestant writer,

present similar difficulties. St. John Chrysostom truly says, that, on such occasions, we should distinguish the writer's motives—*whether founded in impurity of feelings, or anxiety to correct.*—(In Comment. in Epist. ad Thessalon.)

* His name was Malthe-Conrad Bruun, which the French, who, like the Greeks, accommodate foreign sounds to their fastidious ears, transformed to Malte-Brun. He was a native of Norway, and well entitled to be called the modern D'Anville. His merits are well expressed by a most competent judge—M. Louis Reybaud—“La Géographie est arrivée à Malte-Brun, qui le premier l'a embrassée à la fois dans ses détails, et dans son ensemble.”

"is severely felt in Ireland." Now, we shall show, that of all these countries, Holland alone, and a few cities in Germany, were in possession of the Bible, when they adopted the reformed creed; and to this diminished sphere must, of consequence, the action of the Bible be restricted in producing its alleged fruit. Far different, indeed, were its results! For Protestantism, whose pretext was reform, and object spoliation, came, as it were, to a full stop, just as the Scriptures obtained a wider circulation. So little, in truth, did the more diffused use of the Bible second the novel doctrine, that, for nearly three centuries, elapsed since the death of Luther in 1546, (with the sole exception of Holland, and some districts of Germany,) it cannot reckon the accession of a single European people. The Reformation reached, at first bound, its culminating point; and its early triumphs, like those of the Macedonian empire, marked its ultimate confines. The life of Luther was commensurate with its growth, and terminated its conquests.

In demonstrating the prior establishment of the reformation, in almost every country that embraced it, to the existence, and, consequently, to the influence of the bible, we shall adopt the dates assigned by the Rev. Mr. Horne to each national version, in the "Bibliographical Appendix to his Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures." We shall begin with Great Britain, the recognized head and protagonist of Protestantism; premising that our reference to the bible implies the collective body of the scriptures, unmutilated by division—the word of God in unimpaired integrity, such as the advocates of its unrestricted circulation so loudly challenge, and such as our reverend guide, than whom a less objectionable one could not surely be named, contemplated in the chronological list to which we have adverted. It was with a consonant feeling, that the fourth of October 1835 was celebrated as the anniversary of the *completion* of Coverdale's bible—*fynished*, as expressed in the colophon, the *fourthe daye* of October, 1535; and it was similarly, that Bugenhagen commemorated the day on which Luther *consummated* his translation, in which Bugenhagen had been an active assistant, by an annual entertainment, "conducted," says his biographer, "with cheerful gravity, and not the anterior emission of any detached part."—Mr. Townley, vol. ii. p. 283.

The first English bible, usually called Coverdale's, though not *his* sole achievement, is intitled, "Biblia, the Bible, that is, the Holy Scripture of the Olde and Newe Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe. . . . Prynted in the year of our Lorde, MDXXXV, and fynished the

fourthe daye of October." (*Biblioth. Spenc.* vol. i. p. 78.)* No claim is here put forward, it will be observed, of derivation from, or collation of, the original texts; the Douche probably implying Luther's version, and the Latyn the Vulgate. Coverdale, in his address to Henry VIII, makes mention of the king's dearest and just wife, *Jane*, whose marriage did not take place until the 20th May, 1536; so that the publication of the volume, printed, it is supposed at Zurich, certainly abroad, was posterior to this date. Assuming, however, the prior one of October 1535, the third centennial anniversary of which was lately solemnized, as the birth-day and congenital origin of the Reformation in this realm, we pronounce the association an anachronism and preposterous; for it is perfectly ascertained, that England had previously abjured the communion of Rome, or, in equivalent terms, embraced Protestantism. An act, passed the 30th of March, 1534, had abolished the power of the Pope within the kingdom; and in the ensuing month of November, "the decisive act," says Mr. Sharon Turner (*Henry VIII*, p. 571), "was introduced, annulling for ever the papal supremacy, and enacting that the king shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head of the Church of England." Other writers assign an anterior date to the separation, which, according to Mr. Townley, occurred in 1533; and in "*L'art de vérifier les dates*" (tome vii. p. 391) it is stated, "Le parlement d'Angleterre déclara que le roi est le chef suprême de l'église, le 16 Janvier, 1531; but we have followed Hume (iv. p. 136), Lingard (vi. p. 113), Hallam (i. p. 189), and *Statutes of the Realm* (vol. iii. p. 492-508). And the schism, rendered conclusive by the act of November, 1534, was sealed by numerous executions; amongst others, by that of Bishop Fisher on the 25th June, and of Sir Thomas More on the 6th July, 1535, which testified, in characters of purest blood, the renouncement of the communion of Rome, and consequent establishment of Protestantism, previous to the publication of the first English bible.†

* See also Mr. Lowndes's "Bibliographer's Manual," p. 168, *et seq.* Lewis, Newcombe, Todd, Townley, Horne, and others, have minutely described this volume, of which even a repaired copy produced eighty-five guineas at Mr. Dent's sale in 1827. The third volume of David Clément's "Bibliographie Curieuse," Gottingue, 1750-1760. 9 volumes 4to. (a work left imperfect by his death, and of great research for that period), may be consulted likewise with advantage, at p. 415, &c.

† The first Catholic bible, in English, was printed at Douay, in 1609, 2 vols. 4to. preceded by the New Testament, at Rheims, in 1582. This bible was reprinted at Rouen in 1635, 2 vols. 4to. where it is described as the result of forty years' toil and labour, "in consequence of the poor state of the college in banishment." Great sympathy is always expressed for Tyndale, Rogers, Coverdale, and others, who were driven to print their translations abroad; to which our sole objection is, its limitation to party, and consequent absence of principle. Why preclude the Catholic exiles

Several editions followed, in 1537, 1538, 1539, & 1540, &c. ;* but so faint was the impression produced on the popular mind, that, in July 1553, on Mary's accession to the throne, the kingdom resumed its old creed. In fact, as Mr. Hallam observes, (vol. i. p. 140), "Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, found an almost equal compliance with their varying schemes of faith; and nothing could be more illusive than this multiplied emission of bibles; for such restrictions were immediately imposed on their possession or perusal, as to nullify their ostensible object—the popular communication of the word of God." Like the sumptuary laws, the permission was graduated according to rank; for "no women, not gentle or noble, nor artificers, prentices, journeymen, &c. were to read the Bible, or New Testament, in English, to himself, or to any other, privately or openly."† (Stat. of 33 Henry VIII, cap. 12.) Strype, quoted by Mr. Townley, (vol. ii. p. 400), says, that "parsons, vicars, and curates, did read so confusedly the word of God. . . . humming and hawking thereat, that no man could understand, &c." A considerable number of churches were left without the bible; and, in others, it was placed where no poor man could presume to come. (*Newcombe*, p. 53, and *Lewis*, p. 141.) The price, too, fixed by Henry at ten shillings unbound, or twelve shillings bound, equivalent to nearly as many pounds of present currency, rendered scriptural reading, again, similar to the law of divorce, available only to the rich; nor, we believe, was a small or cheap edition, in form or price, published until 1549 (by Daye). These obstacles and inhibitions were subsequently renewed and rigorously enforced at various times. A decree of the Star Chamber, of 1st July 1637, ordered "that the printers shall be reduced to a certain number, and that if any other shall pursue the trade, he shall be set in the pillory, or whipped through the streets."

Scotland had no national version until 1579, when appeared

from the same good feeling; for they, surely, were not more intolerant in creed, or rebels in law? For every obnoxious note in that bible, we could most easily find a parallel in the Protestant theologians of that day; and had not Cranmer and Ridley, the former with characteristic duplicity, but Ridley with bold assertion, upheld, as expressed by Mr. Hallam (vol. i. p. 133), the usurpation of Lady Jane against Mary? This Catholic bible was, as indeed were all Catholic books, rigidly interdicted; yet Catholics are accused of not reading the scriptures—"et secum petulans amentia certat."—*Claudian*.

* Mr. Hallam's estimate of the character of Cranmer, by whose name the bible of 1540 is called, is obviously conveyed in the words which he ascribes to Bossuet, "in whose bitter invective," he says, "the patriarch of our reformed churches stands forth as the most abandoned of time-serving hypocrites." (Vol. i. p. 132.)

† "Adeo imparem libertatem Romæ diti ac pauperi, honorato atque inhonorato esse." (Livy, lib. xxvi. cap. 2.) "There is one law for the rich, and one for the poor in Ireland," was the similar expression of Lord Chancellor Redesdale, early in this century.

"The Bible and Holy Scriptures contained in the Olde and Newe Testament, printed in Edinburg be Alexander Arbuthnot, Printer to the Kingis Maieste." (*Ædes Althorp*. i. p. 29.) But, nearly twenty years before, Calvinism had supplanted the ancient faith; for an act passed in 1560, at the instigation of Knox, to whom, as to Satan himself, "one mass was more fearful than 10,000 armed enemies" (*Macrie's Life of Knox*, vol. ii. p. 24,) made the exercise of the Catholic worship penal, in the merciful gradation of forfeiture of goods, exile, and death. (*Robertson*, i. p. 206.) Dr. Macrie pleasantly dwells on the fruits of biblical reading; but we may learn from history, how far it enlarged the charities and enlightened the minds of Knox and his followers.

In the Highlands, the change of religion foreran its alleged cause by above two centuries; for the first Gaelic bible bears the very recent date of 1802; nor had even the New Testament appeared before 1767, when Dr. Johnson's letter of August 13, 1766, to Mr. W. Drummond (*Croker's edition of Boswell*, vol. ii. p. 27) wrested a reluctant permission for the publication of Dr. Stewart's version, from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, who had previously opposed it, lest it should encourage the use of the native dialect!

The instrument of conversion, in the islands of Scotland, was the *yellow stick*, with which Maclean, the laird of Rum, and others, drove their tenants to the kirk. In 1609, says the late Mr. Donald Gregory (*History of the Western Isles*, &c. 1836), the bishops of the Isles, in a meeting held at Iona, and attended by a kind of congress of insular chiefs, passed the statutes of Icolmkill, which established the reformed Kirk of Scotland.

The Welsh were without a bible until 1588, or fifty years posterior to the creed which it was said to have taught them; nor did a native version appear in the Isle of Man before 1763, though the Reformation had been established there above two centuries.*

All the dependencies of England bowed in passive submission to her will and example, save Ireland, whose resistance to this dictation entailed on her people ages of unrelenting persecution. Reserved for final prey, they had to endure the treatment of the last of slaves." Παλθουην τ' ἂν δεινότερα ἢ οἱ πρὶν δουλόντες (*Thucyd.*) or, in the words of Galgacus to the Caledonians,

* Ebert ("Allgemeines Bibliographisches Lexicon," No. 22,703) says, that Queen Elizabeth's copy of the Welch New Testament (London, 1567, 4to.), is in the royal library of Dresden, of which he is curator, and which contains, as before stated, 260,000 printed, and 2700 manuscript, volumes. (Balbi, *Essai*, &c.)

"ac, sicut in familia recentissimus quisque servorum et conservis ludibrio est, sic nos ut viles in excidium petimur."—(*Taciti Agricola*.) George Brown, created archbishop of Dublin in 1535, "purged the churches, pulled down images," says Mosheim (*Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iv. p. 137) "and caused the king's supremacy to be acknowledged in Ireland." But this legislative or episcopal enforcement produced no native bible; for none appeared until 1685, when one, executed some years before, at the desire of Bedel, bishop of Dromore, was published. Burnet, in his life of that prelate, on relating the circumstance, takes occasion to represent the bible as "a book always so fatal to the Church of Rome." Our readers may have noticed how far this fatal influence was experienced elsewhere; and its contrary effect in Ireland is abundantly notorious.

In Germany, according to the Rev. Mr. Horne, Luther's translation was completed in 1534; but, before that year, almost every Protestant state of the present day had espoused the new creed. In 1525, on the death of Frederic the Wise, of Saxony, who protected the person without adopting the doctrine of Luther, his brother and successor, John, ordered a body of laws to be drawn up by Luther and Melancthon, which served as a precedent for the other princes, who, at the second diet of Spire, on the 29th April, 1529, subscribed the famous protest, whence sprung the designation of Protestants; for the distinction of *reformer* was not assumed until some years after by the Calvinists (*Mosheim*, century xvi.) Robertson (*Charles V*, vol. ii.) places the reception of Lutheranism, in the various states, in the year 1525; and so early as 1522, the furious Carlostadt had incited the people of Wittenberg to the wonted outrages on Catholic worship and monuments; for which he was reproved by Luther, who, in the words of Mosheim's translator, Dr. Maclaine, "could not bear to see another crowned with the glory of executing a plan which himself had laid." (*Mosheim*, vol. iv. p. 59.) Luther was indeed little tolerant of the aberrations of his fellow-reformers in conduct or doctrine. "His *golden rule*," as Mosheim designates it, allowed no latitude of interpretation to the word of scripture—one sense only; and that sense was, of course, his own. The portraiture of the great reformer, as exhibited by himself, in the late compilation of M. Michelet (*Mémoires de Martin Luther*, &c. 1836), is no flattering representation. It is not a seemly image, or attractive object of contemplation, for, on his own evidence, it is difficult to pronounce him sane of mind; of which, indeed, Mr. Hallam (vol. i. p. 80) seems fully aware. But his mastery of the human will—"that spell upon the mind of man"—is sufficient demonstration of his genius.

He was one of those commanding spirits, "un de ces esprits remuans et audacieux," as the eloquent Bossuet paints Cromwell, "qui semblent nés pour changer le monde."

In April, 1525, according to the compilers of "*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*," Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, seized on the duchy of Prussia; expelled the Catholics, and committed such outrages, that even the Protestant princes joined in a confederacy to arrest his violence; but, whether the language of the people was Polish or Luthuanian, we know that no bible existed in the former before 1561 (Mr. Horne says 1596), nor in the latter until 1560. The famous Socinian version, at the cost of Prince Radzivill, in Polish, appeared in 1563.

The light of the Reformation, writes Mosheim (vol. iv. p. 81), was received in Denmark so early as 1521, by Christiern II, "a monarch," he adds, "whose savage and infernal cruelty rendered his name odious, and his memory execrable; but who, nevertheless, was desirous of delivering his dominions from the superstition and tyranny of Rome." After some alternations of success and defeat, the final overthrow of Catholicism was effected in 1536; but the nation was already nearly all Lutheran, under Christiern III. The Catholic clergy were made the victims of persecution; and the bishop of Roschild died in irons after various sufferings. (*Universal History*, vol. xxxii. p. 400.) It was not, however, until 1550, that the first Danish bible was printed, at Copenhagen, by Hans Mikkeston, in folio. Norway, Iceland, and all the dependencies of Denmark, obediently moved in the train of that kingdom, and adopted, as commanded, the new doctrines, though no bible existed in the Norse dialect before 1584; and the earliest Icelandic bears the same date. (*D. Clément, Bibliographie Curieuse*, tom. iv.) Mr. Laing could discover no bible in Lapland, when he lately visited that hyperborean region, though long professedly Protestant; for which, however, he naturally accounts, as very few could read; but an edition was published, in 1811, at Hernsvand, 3 volumes quarto; of course too dear for so poor a people, even if capable of reading it.

Mosheim says, that the Reformation was propagated in Sweden soon after Luther's rupture with Rome. In 1528, Gustavus Vasa made public profession of Lutheranism; and, the following year, the Confession of Augsburg was adopted by a decree of a national council held at Orebro (*L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, tom. viii. p. 225). Vertot affirms that, in 1527, all Sweden was Protestant; but the first Swedish bible is dated in 1541, printed at Upsal, "juxta versionem Martini

Lutheri," which version everywhere was the model and original of all Protestant translations in the north of Europe.

The Russian provinces of the Baltic became Lutheran contemporaneously with, and at the dictation of, Sweden and Denmark; but no Livonian or Esthonian bible appeared until 1689, nor in the Finnish tongue before 1642. The oldest Slavonian bible bears date—"die 12mo Aprilis, 1581—in urbe Ostrobia" (*Biblioth. Spenc.* i. p. 90; and *Clement.* iv. p. 441.)

The first of the Swiss cantons that separated from Rome was Zurich, where Zuinglius, it is asserted, had even preceded Luther in the march of reform. In 1524, according to Mr. Planta, (*History of the Helvetic Confederation*, vol. ii. 371) the new opinions were generally adopted. Mr. Townley places the change in 1523 (vol. ii. p. 356); but Ruchet (*Histoire de la Réformation de Suisse*, tom. i. p. 136-158) fixes it in April 1525. Zuinglius was slain at the battle of Cappel in 1531, fighting against the Catholics.

Berne embraced the scheme of Zuinglius in February 1528; and the cities of Schaffhausen and Basil quickly followed the precedent (*Planta*, ii. p. 385.) Glaris and Apenzil admitted both creeds; being the sole instance, with an evanescent exception in Denmark, of this toleration, until the civil wars of France temporarily closed with the Edict of Nantes in 1598.

The remaining cantons of Switzerland adhered to the ancient faith, on which the first appearance of a bible in the Helvetic idiom in 1529, produced no adverse impression; for not one of the cantons became Protestant after its publication. Amongst the French allies, Calvinism was not formally established at Geneva before 1535, nor at Neuchâtel until the ensuing year (*Art de Vérifier les Dates*, tom. xiv.); but the first bible for the use of the French districts, nominally the work of Olivetan, but principally by Calvin, though bearing the impress of 1535, was not, in reality, concluded or published until 1537. We have also seen, that the dates of the Complutensian Polyglot, and of Coverdale's Bible, preceded their publication; which, most probably, was the case with many others. The first Grison bible appeared in 1657.

Thus, then, Holland alone, with some cities of Germany, as we have stated, can, by possibility, be supposed to owe the Reformation to the perusal of the Bible by the people; for there only, had it pre-existed in the vulgar tongue. The Old Testament was printed at Delft in 1477, but deficient of the psalms, which, with the New Testament, subsequently appeared. Yet, of the seventeen provinces, in whose language, and for whose use, this translation was made, the majority have not swerved

from the Catholic creed; and the tyranny of Spain will sufficiently account for the alienation of the others, without recurring to the agency of the bible. In Germany, likewise, popular versions had numerous appeared, at Mentz, Cologne, Bamberg, Augsburg, Nuremberg, Lubeck, Ulm, and Strashourg; but of these towns many are still Catholic.

The reading of the Scripture, therefore, has not promoted Protestantism; while the ancient faith, yet eminently predominant, reckons in its bosom more than double the number of dissidents of all descriptions; and, responsive to its distinctive character, still maintains a sway commensurate with its appropriate designation of Catholic or universal.

The comparative advance of Catholicism is, indeed, most striking; as may be deduced from unquestionable authority. "About the year 1530," Mosheim complacently asserts, that "the dawn of truth spread itself far and wide; and almost all the European states welcomed its salutary ray." Robertson, and other writers, represent the empire of both religions as nearly balanced in the sixteenth century, as does Schiller in the next age (*Geschichte des Dreyssigjährigen Kriegs, passim*); but it is far otherwise at the present day, as we have seen from Malte Brun; and the disproportion is constantly enlarging. The Catholic population of Germany is now, according to that geographer, 17,906,500, or within a fraction of eighteen millions, while the Protestants hardly exceed twelve (12,032,000). In Bohemia, where the latter were even supposed to preponderate, during, or before, the thirty years' war, the existing proportion he represents as only one to thirty-three, compared to the Catholics. Yet, this is the country which, Mr. Strang assures us, had enjoyed seven editions of a popular bible previous to Luther's,* and where John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and the ferocious Zisca, were supposed to have sown the good seed, whence such mighty fruit was to germinate. Even in Holland, the increase of Catholicism is remarkable; for, according to a census taken within the last twelve months, the seven ecclesiastical districts, into which it is divided, contain nearly 900,000 Catholics, or more than one-third of the entire population. The Catholics of the United States have advanced in a quintuple ratio since 1800.

* We cannot discover this number in our best bibliographical authorities, necessarily the surest on such questions. See Ebert's Lexicon, No. 2137 et seq. The earliest edition is of 1488, followed by another in 1489, and two or three later in date. Mr. Strang probably included some editions of the New Testament in his enumeration, (the first of which appeared in 1475) or some other partial publication, which it was not unusual to distinguish as the *Bible*, until of late years, when greater accuracy of research established the difference.

But, probably, our own empire exhibits the most pregnant evidence of Catholic growth. The metropolis, we may assert, now contains a number nearly equal to what existed in all England, on the accession of George III, in 1760. Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, &c., display an equal advance; which we must observe, is always most conspicuous where industry is most flourishing. In June, 1836, a committee reported to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, "that about a century ago, Popery was confined to the remote districts of the country, but now splendid churches were rapidly rising for the celebration of its idolatrous worship; and Glasgow," it is added, "contains more Catholics than existed in all Scotland in 1679." (*Annual Register* for 1836.) It is, we believe, incontestable, that the Catholic inhabitants of the three kingdoms now outnumber any other religious denomination; and daily reports place beyond controversy their rapid propagation in the British colonies.

Ireland, however, presents to our view the most steady progression, and effective strength of Catholicism. Swift, about a century ago, looked, as he said, upon the Irish Catholics, "altogether as inconsiderable, or powerless, as women and children. Popery," he added, "must crumble away; the Popish priests are all registered, and can have no successors," &c. And so late as 1780, Burke, in addressing the electors of Bristol, calculated the Catholics of Ireland at sixteen to seventeen hundred thousand, with an assurance that he did not exaggerate the number! In 1731, the Catholic residents of the Queen's County were computed at 16,000, while the Protestants reckoned 1,900; but, in 1831, after a lapse of a century, according to the census of that year, the former amounted to 64,225, and the latter had dwindled to 1,400;—nor is this an unfair specimen of the growing disproportion.

Another important association of the new doctrines challenges attention. It is, that their advance was in the inverse direction of existing civilization, of which Italy was the undisputed centre; for it was in proportion as the alleged reform receded from the proximity or influence of intellectual culture, that it met acceptance. In Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, the southern provinces of Germany, and the Netherlands, then the most enlightened portion of Europe, it was generally repelled, while it was unhesitatingly embraced by the barbarians of Scandinavia. That was, indeed, the golden age of Italy, under Leo X; of France, under the *Father of Letters*; of Spain and the provinces of Burgundy, under Charles V; and of Portugal, ruled by Emmanuel: but the regions of the north, when they so promptly

enlisted under the banners of Luther, were sunk in most unlettered rudeness. Not only had not the bible appeared in their respective tongues, but not a single author of antiquity, unless possibly in extracts or selections for mere elementary instruction, had been published in any one of these easy conquests of the Reformation—facts sufficiently illustrative, it must be conceded, both of the non-influence of scriptural reading in generating reform, and of the absence of the acknowledged sources of cultivated education in these nations.

Nor was this evidence of illiteracy less striking in England, where, with the exception of some detached portions, for the use of schools, of Virgil, Terence, or Cicero, no classic had issued from the press. The edition of the younger Pliny, which had been imposed upon Dr. Askew, as printed at Oxford in 1469 by F. Corsellis, was soon pronounced spurious (*Biblioth. Spenc.* ii. 271); but, even for many years subsequent to the Reformation, no complete edition of a Greek or Roman author appears to have been printed in Great Britain. Indeed, we are not sure that any Greek volume preceded the New Testament of 1592; nor, until 1663, the date of Stanley's *Æschylus*, had the nation produced a critical, or a *citabile* edition of any classic author; though we are not insensible of the value of Sir H. Saville's *St. John Chrysostom*, in 1613. (See *Beloe's Anecdotes of Literature*, vol. v.)

To Catholic Europe, on the other hand, we are indebted for every extant Latin classic, from the Offices of Cicero in 1465, to the Phædrus of 1596, as well as for nearly all the Greek authors, beginning, as is meet, with the Florentine Homer of 1488—"the first in birth, the first in fame." If literature derived any advantage from the Reformation in England, the fruit, assuredly, was of slow growth. In 1603, when the University of Oxford addressed James the First on his accession to the throne, Dr. Thorpe could find no Hebrew types to express, as Hebrew professor, his gratulations. "*Sed enim typographo deerant characteres*," was his excuse; and this, be it observed, occurred in the *first* Protestant kingdom and university of Europe, almost a century after the Hebrew Bible had been printed in Spain, and one hundred and fifteen years posterior to its publication in Italy, in 1488. (*Bibl. Spenc.* vol. i. p. 75.)

It has long been a hacknied phrase and assumed position, that the discovery of printing had been a main instrument of the Reformation. That this mighty engine imparted a powerful movement to every spring of human action, and excited one of those paroxysms of restlessness, which threaten or produce revolution, must be admitted; but, that it gave any moral impulse,

or, that the light it diffused lent any aid to the new doctrines, is contradicted by the incontrovertible fact, that they succeeded least where the art was most cultivated. Not only previous to, but for no short interval after, the Reformation, the presses of Italy and France were in teeming activity, when "few, and far between," were the productions of the great Protestant kingdoms, which altogether, were inferior in number, during the entire sixteenth century, to those of the single city of Venice. Nor would a comparison of these collective monarchies, comprising nearly the whole territorial sway of Protestantism in that age, with other Catholic cities, such as Paris* or Rome, offer a less decisive testimony of the little sympathy between the Reformation and the great invention, which cannot, in reason, be imagined most favourable where least encouraged. Repelled by the most enlightened nations of Europe, it was where the influence of the press, at once the cause and result of that superiority, was, from its narrow compass of action, inconsiderable, or nearly unknown, that the new creed found the most welcome access. Hume, though he supports the pretended alliance, fairly adds, "that the rapid advance of the Lutheran doctrine, and the violence with which it was embraced, prove sufficiently that it owed not its success to reason and reflection."

ART. VIII.—1. *Annual Reports of the Agent for Emigrants at Quebec, printed by order of the House of Commons, 1831 to 1836.*

2. *New York Shipping and Passenger Returns, 1826 to 1836.*

TO suppose that apology were necessary for bestowing a few thoughts upon such of Ireland's unhappy sons as have been driven by circumstances to seek a home in the new world, were, we feel satisfied, to imagine a libel, not merely on the Irish, but upon the British people also.

But few, however, of our readers are perhaps aware of the extent to which their best sympathies are due in this direction;

* In an edict, dated the 9th April, 1513, Louis XII thus expresses his views of the benefits of the press.—"En considération du grand bien qui est advenu en nostre royaume de l'art et science d'impression, l'invention de laquelle semble estre plus divine qu'humaine, par laquelle nostre foy catholique a este grandement augmentée et corroboree," &c. Such was the language of encouragement, just previously to the Reformation, which produced far different sentiments in his successors. (*Résumé historique de l'Introduction de l'Imprimerie*, par M. Taillandier, 1837.)

and it is this reflection which has determined us to throw together such portion of our transatlantic experience as regards the "whereabout" of the Irish in America.

Men may be induced to emigrate to the new world,—the modern land of promise,—by motives which, although perhaps traceable to the same, or nearly the same metaphysical elements, are, in their effects, of very opposite character.

An ambitious and somewhat restless spirit, on the one hand—the usual concomitant of youth, health, and vigour, may excite hopes of success and good fortune in a new and wide field of exertion, which an old and thickly-peopled country scarcely offers to the most sanguine. This motive to emigrate is entirely of the attractive kind. The emotions with which it is accompanied are wholly pleasurable, and although the promises and expectations of youth are, we are told, but rarely fulfilled in age, it will not be disputed, that those exertions which are the offspring of confidence and self-reliance, go far indeed to ensure success and its consequent happiness.

A long course of misery and privation, on the other hand, is calculated to create a feeling of despair. All idea of securing any degree of comfort at home is banished. In such a case, emigration may be resorted to as a species of forlorn hope. Exertion being paralysed, mental elasticity destroyed, hope utterly extinguished, the unfortunate is induced to remove, not because he has any confidence in the future, but because his wretched condition being incapable of becoming worse, he is willing to tempt the chapter of accidents, on the chance, not in the hope, of a change for the better.

From countries other than Ireland, emigration may proceed from the first-named motive. Men may be induced to move by the hope of benefit. From Ireland, it proceeds, we regret to say, for the most part, from the last-named motive. The industrious peasant is driven to expatriate himself by the dread of impending evil. Persecution, both political and religious, (for, let no man say, that the latter does not exist where men have to pay double for the privilege of worshipping God after their own fashion), and poverty the most biting, are the chief expatriating causes in constant operation in Ireland.

America has, from time to time, afforded an asylum to Irishmen of the highest endowments and virtue, who have been unsuccessful in their attempts to resist the oppressions of the blighting oligarchy which it has been the insane policy of the British Government hitherto to uphold. We find "Irish rebels," (so called), and their descendants, now numbered amongst America's most honoured citizens. The name of Emmett for

instance, is to be found in connexion with high professional station,—with the bar, the medical profession, the professor's chair; and others of a similar character might be quoted.

But it is not of this small class that we have to speak. Our business, indeed, is not with individuals at all, it is with the industrious mass,—the thousands and tens of thousands, who are compelled by the poverty consequent upon a most vicious political and social state, to court fortune in a distant, and to them, unknown region. These we shall endeavour to trace to their new resting place, and noting the new circumstances by which they are surrounded, mark, so far as lies in our power, the changes which these new circumstances have brought about; and of some of which we have been a percipient witness.

The two principal points to which emigration from Europe, and especially from Ireland, is directed, are New York and Quebec, both convenient stopping places in the way to the "far west." Passengers are also landed at other ports, Boston and Philadelphia, for instance, in the United States, and St. John's, St. Andrew's, Halifax, &c., in the British provinces. But the numbers are inconsiderable, and, moreover, no regular returns are furnished.

Of the numbers landed at Quebec and New York, during each of the eleven years ending in 1836, the following is a statement:—

Year.			Quebec.			New York.		
1826	}					4,225		} 40,126
1827		-	-	23,160	-	7,077	-	
1828						5,664		
1829	-	-	9,614	-		2,674	-	12,288
1830	-	-	18,300	-		3,766	-	22,066
1831	-	-	34,135	-		6,582	-	40,717
1832	-	-	28,204	-		6,936	-	35,140
1833	-	-	12,013	-		10,096	-	22,109
1834	-	-	19,208	-		12,028*	-	31,236
1835	-	-	7,108	-		8,825	-	15,933
1836	-	-	12,596	-		15,135	-	27,731
<hr/>								
Total from Ireland,		-	164,338	-		83,008	-	247,346
From other countries,		-	113,803	-		258,862	-	372,665
<hr/>								
Total from all places,		-	278,141	-		341,870	-	620,011

* The New York return for the last three years is not classed, hence the numbers from Ireland are assumed at the average proportion. It may not be quite correct for any one year, but is most likely so for the three.

Of the total emigration into Canada, more than half, or fifty-nine-hundredths are from Ireland; of that into New York, the proportion is only one-fourth. This is easily accounted for. New York is a recipient for emigrants from every European country, whilst Canada receives but few from any other country than the British Isles. If the Irish and British settlers were compared at New York, it is probable the proportion would be nearly as large.

It is no part of our design to write a treatise on emigration, or to enumerate the evils incidental to the present mode of conducting it. Nevertheless, we cannot give an idea of the changes which take place in the condition of the settler, without touching briefly on these topics.

We must first remind the reader, that emigration from the United Kingdom is spontaneous. The law gives it no direction or impulse. It ordains, that the passenger shall have a certain amount of ship-room, and that there shall be on board the ship a certain quantity of some sort of food and of water; but farther than this, the law gives itself no concern. No attempt is made to encourage any, the most imperfect selection as to age, so as to render emigration in the highest degree efficient. As there is no certain provision in Ireland for the old, and the expense of their maintenance, therefore, falls upon the young,—with the young they must of course be removed. This must greatly enhance the difficulties which the industrious settler has to encounter and overcome. Neither does the law care for the condition of the settler after he has landed. For forty-eight hours has he the law's protection, after which, for aught the British law cares, he may perish.

This brings us to the first *phase* in the settler's new condition. At the ports of debarkation, there is a continual out-pouring of competitors for employment. As they are, for the most part, destitute in the first instance of the means of conveying themselves to those parts of the country—and these are fortunately every where—where their labour is in demand, they are compelled to bid against each other, and against the permanent labourers in the labour market, which, in consequence, perpetually exhibits the phenomenon of a glut of hands. Whilst there has been an actual scarcity of labour in many parts of the country—whilst £2. 10s., £3., and even £4. per month, with food, has been offered labourers by public advertisement, we have known a dainty servant glad to hire himself at 25s. per month, until he was able to save a few dollars to pay the cost of moving up the country, when he was fain to strip off his faded livery, and familiarise himself with the plough or the axe.

Though the labour markets at the ports of debarkation, and some of the principal stopping places, are thus perpetually overstocked, and wages constantly always comparatively low; the evil does not long afflict the individual. The wages, although low for a new country, are sufficiently high to admit of saving, so that, in a very short time, the recent immigrant begins to move into the interior, stopping and working as his funds run low, or as improved wages offer themselves.

In Canada this evil has been greatly mitigated, we may almost say removed, by a wise and benevolent enactment of the provincial legislature. By this act, a payment of 5*s.* per head is exacted from ships bringing passengers. The money thus collected is divided into four equal parcels, whereof two hospitals for the reception of emigrants respectively get a share, and the other two shares are assigned to the Emigrant Societies of Quebec and Montreal; being expended in forwarding recent immigrants to their final destination, and in occasional relief in case of distress.

The effect of this law is equivalent to a guarantee that every emigrant has the means of conveyance to the interior. The sum may seem small for the purpose; but let it be remembered that it is *an average sum* paid by all, but expended on a portion only,—namely, on the most destitute. Thus it fulfils its purpose.

Yet this law, admirable as it is, has its enemies, in all those who are engaged in what has been not inaptly called the *white slave trade*. We should be sorry to condemn a whole class, even though the majority should be proved to be base. There may be such phenomena as disinterested land jobbers, benevolent masters of passenger ships, and sentimental emigrant brokers; but, speaking generally, the constant contemplation of the filth, squalor, and misery of crowded passenger ships, seems to blunt the gentler sympathies, and the whole tribe of those who extract profits out of emigration, see in the above law only an abridgement of their gains. They raise a cry of “animosity to emigration,” they mendaciously attribute it to the “French party,” though they know it was the proposal and work of Englishmen. But their efforts have fortunately been of no avail. The “tax,” as they delight to call it, continues to work its benefits, opening the high wages of the country to the swarming labourers of the towns. Under a wise system of emigration, such a law would doubtless be unnecessary. When such a system is instituted, let the law be repealed; but while the present system continues, we trust it will remain as a protection to the destitute.

By the laws of New York, there is a similar contribution levied on the ship-owner, but it is not expended in forwarding.

It is merely an hospital fund. In addition to this contribution, the ship-master is required to give bond that no passenger brought by his ship shall become chargeable on the city funds within a certain time. This induces some circumspection in taking passengers. A lame beggar, with a bag of oatmeal and a sack of potatoes, would be rejected by the master of a ship which was taking passengers for New York; whereas he would find no difficulty in securing a passage to Canada. For this reason, combined with the low rate of passage to Canada, caused by the number of ships engaged in the timber trade which go to British America in ballast, the condition of the settlers who proceed by way of New York, is somewhat superior to that of the settlers by the way of the river St. Lawrence.

The most powerful circumstance influencing the distribution of emigrants, is previous habits. The agricultural peasantry seldom stay longer in the cities than they are obliged. If in a destitute condition—if possessed of little or nothing but their hands—they are to be seen anxiously seeking such employment as they are capable of undertaking; keeping ever in sight a settlement in the interior, with a steadiness of purpose which is invariably crowned with success. It is among the females of this class that begging prevails. In the cities of Quebec, Montreal, New York, and Albany, (but seldom in more inland towns, and *never* on the roads or in the country,) females surrounded with children are to be seen asking alms, and the expressed purpose is always "to get up the country." While this is going on, the males of the family are either working, or seeking work, with the same end in view; and where three-quarters of a dollar (3s. 1½d. sterling) is deemed low wages, it will be at once perceived that the beggar of to-day is often lost sight of to-morrow. In Quebec and Montreal, in two or three weeks after the last arrival, and before the close of the upward navigation, the vestiges of this destitute class are nearly obliterated, being confined perhaps to a few widowed mothers and orphan children, and a handful of profligate and improvident people, who are to be met with in all countries.

But it is not among the agricultural population of Ireland alone that emigration takes place. The towns annually furnish a large number. These persons being skilled in all kinds of labour usually required in towns, are prone to remain either in the cities in which they land, or in the towns throughout the country. They, of course, command higher wages than the mere unskilled labourer; and as the cities become drained of hands towards the close of the season, they are generally enabled to make advantageous permanent contracts. The rapid progress of building in the Canadian and American cities, furnishes

a vast and increasing amount of employment to Irish mechanics and labourers. The shipping of Quebec and New York gives employment to another class. Of the cartmen, porters, and warehousemen also, a large proportion are Irish. But there is this feature in employment in America, which is wanting in Great Britain and Ireland, namely, its progressive character. The porter of to-day, whose only capital is a stout rope, or a strong leather strap, will, before long, become the owner of a barrow. In due time his barrow is exchanged for a horse and cart. After a while, he is enabled to purchase a second horse and cart, and becomes a master carter. His progress is now rapid; he has more leisure on his hands; he devotes a portion of his time to public matters; he aspires to municipal office, is chosen, and thus forms a part of the system of self-government which has now for upwards of half a century been in successful operation in the United States of America.

Men who start from a higher point, as regards intelligence and skill, have fewer difficulties to struggle against. Mechanical skill especially, is not merely highly rewarded, but new roads to advancement are continually opening to it. The steam-boat—the canal—the railroad—are all steps to fortune, in a country where hands are seldom supplied to the full extent required. It cannot be deemed out of place here to mention that Andrew Jackson, the late President of the United States, was the son of an Irish emigrant, and was born either just before his parents left Ireland, or just after their arrival in the then Colonies.

The reader will now be prepared to learn, that in New York, Quebec, and Montreal, the Irish are a very influential body. In New York especially, it is actually a grave subject of complaint with one political party, that "the Irish govern the city, and rule the elections." Let it be remembered, that this complaint is made in a city where the majority only can prevail; so that it stands as evidence of numerical power, which, in such a case, is legitimate power. It is a standing joke in that city, that an Irishman, being asked how he intended to vote, and not having gotten rid of his old country associations, exclaimed, "against the government, any how." It so happens, however, that the Irish in America for the most part vote with the government; that is, with the democratic or popular party, and against the federal or privilege-craving class. Now, in New York city, this class, though in a minority, is very numerous. At the elections, it is prone to put in practice the arts of intimidation, so common in this country; but, as the voter has the protection of the ballot, the popular party has always prevailed. It is by this wealthy class, that the complaints to which we have already alluded are usually put forward; and as the New York press is for

the most part under their controul, by means of their mercantile advertising patronage, it is not at all wonderful that our commercial connexions make us more acquainted with these complaints than with the explanation thereof. There are thirteen or fourteen daily papers in New York, of which the democratic party is only able to support two, namely, the *Evening Post* and the *Times*, so that, in nearly all cases, our views of American affairs are seen through a false medium.

Miss Martineau, in her able and courageous account of the state of society in the United States, exposes most completely the character of the wealthy privilege-desiring class, and, among other things, explains that most of the outrageous Lynch law mobs are composed of *gentlemen*. From personal knowledge, we can bear testimony to the truth of the statement, in a sufficient number of cases to warrant its being received as the general rule. During the election of 1832, for instance, the class in question strained every nerve, but without success, to defeat every candidate for office who was in favour of the Jackson or democratic party; it was an important point with them to create a fear of the operation of democracy—to make the people, in short, afraid of the people. Among the means resorted to, was that of closing all places of business,—warehouses, stores, shops, &c. The effect was, that the whole population was turned, in an excited state, into the streets. In the course of the election, all sorts of petty jealousies were fomented between the Irish and native American population, and some fights took place. Hereupon loud were the complaints of the “turbulence of the people,” “the undue influence of the Irish,” and so forth. But the majesty of the law prevailed. The authorities were enabled generally to keep order, and the grand object of the “Bank, or Whig party,”* as they are called, was defeated.

Every now and then, some of the choice spirits of the “great Atlantic city,” amuse themselves, when tired of wantonly assaulting the coloured people, (their more constant pastime) by attacking the Irish. As Irishmen never were in the habit of quietly presenting a second cheek when the first had been smote, the result invariably is—blows in return. Occasionally it may be, Pat does venture beyond the mere line of defence, and handsomely punishes his aggressors. Now, however strange it may appear, your genuine gentlemen mobs never can take (they cannot even give) a sound beating quietly. The day after said beating, their papers are filled with the disinterested and sympathetic bewailings of the advertisement-bribed editors, whose

* The Democratic Party is stigmatized as the “Tory” party, because it is possessed of the government; the privilege-hunting party is called Whig.

eloquence is perchance farther excited, by a broken scone falling to the share of one of their honourable and dignified corps. Think of such respectables being soundly drubbed by a parcel of vulgar mechanics and labourers ! Verily, "the Irish must be put down ;" they must be "taxed ;" "doors must be shut upon them ;" they must be "declared contraband,"—or fair New York will speedily become an Irish city.

The following account of one of these attacks upon the Irish is from a recent number of the *New York Times*, a well-conducted democratic paper :—

"On Tuesday night a riot occurred at the corner of Mott and Walker streets. From affidavits made at the police office, it appears that a number of persons resolved to amuse themselves by an attack on "the b—dy Irish." They accordingly commenced operations by attacking a house in the above neighbourhood. The inmates armed themselves with pokers, tongs, &c., and quickly repulsed the assailants. A party of watchmen, hearing of the affray, proceeded to the spot. The Irish, supposing the assailants were returning in greater numbers, by mistake rushed upon the watchmen, by whom a number were taken prisoners. The magistrates have expressed their decided opinion, that the Irish were not the assailants, and that the attack was wanton and unprovoked. Notwithstanding, the *Commercial** insists on knowing best, and serves up the Irish as if they were so many strawberries, a mouthful each."

The *Evening Star*, too, a paper of the anti-democratic and *pro tanto* anti-Irish paper, admits that the Irish were aggrieved, and even speaks of these attacks as a common practice.

"Some of our rowdies (says the *Star*) last night, in their shameful practice of attacking the Irish, made an assault on two Americans in mistake, one of whom, a gentleman from Poughkeepsie, they shamefully beat ; the other escaped in a house near by in the Bowery."

We shall pass over the cowardly attacks which have been made by the fanatical convent-burners of Boston on the Irish of that city, because they were "religious" attacks, and moreover, throw no light on the subject-matter of this article. Suffice it to say, that the warm attachment of the Irish to popular rights—to political and religious freedom—has caused them to identify themselves with the system of government which prevails in their adopted country, and this alone is enough to unite them in brotherly amity with the mass of the people, in common cause against the remnants of the federal party.

In Canada, in like manner, we find them acting with the majority, and the House of Assembly, against the local oligarchy,

* The *Commercial* is a paper of the anti-democratic or Whig (Anglicè, *Tory*) party.

and especially against the coercive resolutions of the British Government. The infamous Orange societies of Ireland have, we are sorry to say, also found their way across the Atlantic, and have taken root in the upper province, under the auspices of a Mr. Ogle Gowan, a person of disreputable character, who is stated, in the evidence on Orange Lodges, collected by a Committee of the House of Commons, to have been discountenanced by the parent society, on account of his tarnished reputation. However, such societies must die away before the influence of adverse opinion, and even now they are seldom heard of, except during a contested election, where the local government finds them useful.

Before we leave the Irish of the towns, and follow those of the country, we must give another piece of evidence exhibiting the Irish character, under its new developement, in a favourable light. The document to which we allude, is a jail return, comprising the prisons of three States, namely, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. It is as follows:—

Received in	-	-	1828	1829	1830	1831	1832
New York—							
Sing-Sing	-	-	143	163	356	352	264
Irish	-	-	13	3	15	22	22
Auburn	-	-	174	170	114	174	192
Irish	-	-	15	10	3	12	13
Connecticut—							
Wethersfield	-	-	42	83	63	58	57
Irish	-	-	3	1	1	2	1
New Jersey	-	-	41	36	61	65	46
Irish	-	-	1	1	4	7	1
Total No. received	-	-	400	445	594	649	559
Irish	-	-	32	15	23	43	37
Total received during the five years	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,657
Irish	-	-	-	-	-	-	150

or, 5.64 per cent.

We regret that we have not a classified statement of the offences for which these one hundred and fifty persons suffered punishment. The following piece of testimony on the subject, however, from a New York paper of neutral politics, called the *Journal of Commerce*, says much in favour of the Irish in America:—

"You will scarcely ever find an Irishman dabbling in counterfeit money, or breaking into houses, or stealing, or swindling: but if there is any fighting to be done, he is very apt to have a hand in it. Our reporter, who attends the Police and Sessions' Courts—himself an Irishman—has frequently noticed this fact."

And even this fighting is the result of some sudden excitement. A Montreal paper observes on this same point:—"Although Pat may occasionally 'meet with a friend and for love knock him down,' there is, it must be allowed, but little 'malice prepense' in his whole composition."

Distress is too frequently the parent of crime. In old and thickly-peopled countries, where the number of the competitors for employment have a perpetual tendency to exceed the means of employing them, it is not surprising that the frightful misery which ensues should drive men to the commission of acts of delinquency, which, under other circumstances, they would avoid. The father of a starving family, who steals a loaf of bread to allay the cravings of his half-famished children, can scarcely be deemed a criminal; and although society, for its own protection, may visit such acts with punishment, that punishment is of the exemplary, not of the *vindictive* kind. It is intended to be motive-creating; and although the legislator cannot, the philanthropist *must*, draw a marked line between the offences which spring from necessity and those which spring from vicious habit. A single crime does not make an habitual criminal. A man who forms a single project, is not a projector in the ordinary sense of the word,* neither does any man think of stigmatizing as a drunkard him who is once "overtaken" over a social board. We need not multiply illustrations. We have always felt convinced of the truth of the proposition which Mr. Bulwer's novel of *Paul Clifford* seems to have been designed to illustrate,—namely, that "Man is the creature of circumstances;" but had we entertained a doubt on the subject, the absence of crime among the Irish in America would have generated the opinion.

When it is considered that a long course of misery might be presumed, without direct evidence of the fact, to operate unfavourably on the character of the people of the "old country" generally, and that the mass of the hired labourers of the State of New York are Irish, the force of the new circumstances in the midst of which they are placed, as shown in the small amount of crime, and improved habits generally, is truly surprising. "It is a pleasing record," says the *New York Courier and Enquirer*, "in favour of the sons of the Emerald Isle."

* Whateley's Logic.

Let us now take leave of the Irish of the towns, and follow the agricultural settler to his home in the wilds, where he is busily engaged hewing fortune out of the primeval forest.

The agricultural labourer, who reaches America with nothing but his hands, we have already described as lingering only just so long, in the city at which he has landed, as will enable him to proceed up the country. Here his first step towards comfort and a home is employment on public works. The rapid progress of canal, road, and railroad, in America, is in every mouth. Hence there is always something of the kind, to *absorb*, as the phrase is, the current immigration of the season. Now, on these public works, wages are seldom below ten dollars, and we have seen labourers called to a particular spot, by advertisement, offering sixteen dollars a month, besides food. Now, food being ample, and the Irish settler having generally a fair stock of clothing with him, these sixteen dollars become an accumulating surplus, which, in a twelvemonth, converts the labourer into an independent landowner. Land in the United States is sold at one dollar and a quarter per acre, cash; so that an industrious man, for one hundred dollars, or for a little more than twenty pounds, can obtain a quarter section, or eighty acres of the richest land. It will be readily conceived, that the labourer is not long in becoming an independent landowner; indeed, for his own ultimate comfort, the transition takes place too early; the labourer is induced to take land before he possesses the means of working it; whereas, were he to make up his mind to labour for a while for hire, his present gains would be materially improved; and when he was in a condition to go upon the land, his fortune and prospects would develop themselves more rapidly. The best way to ensure a miserably poor population, is, undoubtedly, to grant land on application. The labourer will then refuse to work for hire, and the capitalist, being unable to procure labour, is literally scared out of the country. Charge a price, however, for land, and the labourer must work for hire for a while. What are the consequences? There is at once a supply of labour; the capitalist is again attracted to the country; and inasmuch as by the concurrence of labour and capital, the gross return from the land is greatly increased, it follows, that the share received by the labourer in the shape of wages, is absolutely greater than the whole produce which he could possibly draw from the soil by his own unassisted labour. Now, let us look at the other compartment of the picture. In the event of a minimum price being fixed for land, how superior is the condition of a labourer when he becomes a purchaser. He has paid a sum of money for his land. Let us suppose it is his last shilling. Inasmuch

as land cannot be had elsewhere for less, his credit is good in the nearest town for nearly, if not quite, the value of his land. He can go to the merchant for his plough, his provisions, and his seed-corn, on the credit of "his crops that are to be." In short, he has at once become a substantial yeoman. We cannot, in this place, give full developement to this and other principles of colonization, for which the world is indebted to the able and acute author of "*England and America*." At present, we must content ourselves by saying, that, in favour of those principles, we bring the testimony of a long experience in new countries, and that at some future, and probably not a very distant, period, we shall take up the subject at length.

Man is assuredly the creature of circumstances, and in no case is this proposition so abundantly evidenced as in that of the Irish in America. Possessed of land under the favourable condition of purchase, not of grant, the Irish peasant becomes a new being. He labours not for a landlord but for himself;—he, therefore, labours cheerfully and vigorously. No "hanging gale" lies like an incubus upon his mind, overweighing its elasticity, damping its energies, and converting frugality and parsimony into what may well be called virtual improvidence. His savings are his own; he, therefore, saves. In short, to use the words of Mr. Laing, the intelligent and truly philanthropic author of "*A Residence in Norway*"—a book by the way which every body should read—"the restraints of property are upon him."

Among the settlers of the country, as among those of the towns, it would be wrong to judge generally by the condition of those few who take into the new country capital and knowledge, with all the superior habits which capital and knowledge are prone to generate. Some of the best farmers in the Canadas and the Northern States are Irishmen of the more fortunate (we eschew the word better) class; and it is worthy of notice, that it is to the pen of an Irish farmer that the American agriculturist is indebted for an admirable treatise on agriculture adapted to the North American climate.*

Looking, then, only to the poorest—the least fortunate of the Irish settlers, the philanthropist will have cause for genuine satisfaction. The second season finds him in the midst of comparative comfort and ease, the first stage towards independence and wealth. We have, at this moment, in our "mind's eye," several flourishing settlements, composed almost exclusively of Irish, once the poorest, on spots which a few years since were

* Evans's *Canadian Agriculture*, Montreal, 1836.

unbroken forest. By some of these, populous towns are supplied with the produce of the dairy, with poultry, pork, vegetables, &c., whilst the larger farmers, generally the older settlers, grow for a more distant market.

Captain Basil Hall, in his account of some Irish settlements in Upper Canada, gapes and wonders on what appears to us to be not merely a natural but a most creditable feeling on the part of the poor settlers.

"It was curious to observe," says Captain Hall, "that most of these settlers, however destitute they may notoriously have been in Ireland, always contrived to evade any acknowledgment of the fact when direct questions were put to them, and seemed rather to wish I should believe they had been very well off at home."

Among those settlers, Captain Hall meets with an old man, who, with his family, had gone upon the land the previous year. Him, through the introduction of the government agent, the gallant Captain is enabled to put to the question, and the following was the result:—

"For a long time he eluded all my interrogatories with great address. He could not say whether he were better off now than he had been at home, though he admitted that here he was master of a large free property, and in Ireland he had only a farm; the rent of which, by his own confession, he had never been able to pay.

"Would you like, then, I asked, to be put down in Ireland again, Mr. Cornelius, just as you were?"

"I would, Sir."

"Then why don't you go.—Who hinders you?"

"Because, Sir—because of the boys."

"What of the boys?" I asked.

"Oh! it's because my two sons like this country very well; they have chopped twenty acres of land, and we have got crops of wheat and oats, and Indian corn and potatoes, and some turnips, all coming up and almost ready to cut, besides five or six more acres all ready chopped and logged, and soon to be in cultivation; and the boys like their independence. In short, Sir, it is a fine country for the poor man if he be industrious, and were it not for the ague a good country and a rich one; though, to be sure, it's rather out of the way, and the roads are bad, and the winter very cold, yet there is always plenty to eat, and sure employment, and good pay, for them that like to work. * * * For all that,' he continues, 'I might have done very well in Ireland.'

"Why the plague, then,' I asked, 'did you remove to America?"

"Oh, Sir,' cried he, laughing, and harping upon the old string, 'it was all entirely owing to the boys. They were not content I should be left without them, and I was not content they should go without me * * * In short, Sir, we resolved to go together, and here we are very happy and contented, and here we will remain.'"—*Hall's Travels in America*, c. x.

The poor Irishman's former condition was a painful theme; it was doubtless fraught with the most revolting associations. That Captain Hall should have probed the poor man's healing wounds, proves only his extreme ignorance of the more delicate portions of our mental organization. Instead of wondering with Captain Hall that his questions were evaded, our marvel is, that the insolence of the questioner was not resented on the spot. The wondrous forbearance of the poor Irishman can only be accounted for by the fact, that he had been too long accustomed to insult and aristocratic insolence in his own land, to be much surprised at it in his new country. The extract is chiefly valuable to us as a farther piece of evidence of the prosperity which attends the Irish in America.

The first and most honourable use which the Irish settler makes of his prosperity, is to provide for the education of his children. A pretty exclusive acquaintance with the Irish in America,* enables the writer of this article to pronounce this to be the "salient point" of the Irish character. In Ireland, misery may cause it to lie dormant; but in America, where the depressing influence of poverty and wretchedness is speedily removed, the latent spark is rapidly kindled into a bright and enduring flame. This anxiety is, to a certain extent, shared by settlers from all nations, but it appears most conspicuous among the Irish, probably from the extreme unfavourableness of their previous condition to any thing like moral cultivation. Thus the second generation of the Irish in America, affords a favourable and accurate sample of what Ireland might, and would be, under an improved social system. The picture is hope-exciting in the extreme.

Another feature in the character of the Irish in America is, that they never forget the less fortunate friends whom they left behind. It is impossible to take up an American shipping newspaper, without seeing numerous advertisements addressed "to persons desirous of having out their friends from Ireland," and intimating "that passages may be secured by applying and paying the passage-money to so and so." From Cork, Waterford, and Belfast, a large number of passages are thus engaged every year. No one can have any, the slightest acquaintance with the course and incidents of emigration, without being acquainted with numerous cases where persons recently destitute

* It may, perhaps, be proper to state that the writer of this article was never in Ireland, his only knowledge of the state of that country is derived from a somewhat careful examination of the Evidence collected by the Commissioners of the Irish Poor Inquiry, and especially from the very able work of Mr. Revans, which has already been carefully reviewed in the third number of this publication.

have, after a very short time, become the means of relieving, in this way, the destitution of others. The charity of the rich may count for something. Sorry, indeed, should we be to doubt its existence, but at whatever we may state it, the charity of the poor towards the poor would count it ten times over. Ireland feels this in every way, but in no way more so than in that which we have just pointed out.

There is one fact in the Irish about America which will doubtless astound those who are prone to philosophise gratuitously about unhappy Ireland. It is that whiskey is extremely cheap, and drunkenness as rare as sunshine in November. In some parts of North America, whiskey can be brought as low as ten pence per gallon, and in few places is good malt whiskey higher than a couple of shillings. Now Irishmen, in Ireland, are known to make free with whiskey whenever they can get it, and the sapient inference is, that if they could always get it, they would always be making free with it. Without any specific facts, it would be easy to show that the reasoning is unsound; but, in the present case, such a mode of showing is unnecessary. We have the fact that the Irish in America are not a drunken race; the next thing is to account for it.

A miserable, hopeless, despairing man, is likely to have habits differing widely from those of a thriving and industrious man. One of the habits usually found with hopeless men is that of intoxication. Some, it is true, may resist it, but generally speaking, a wretched outcast will indulge in ardent spirits whenever he has an opportunity. It is owing to the rarity of the opportunity, that the habit with Irishmen is much less firmly rooted than some persons may be disposed to allow; hence, when the miserable man is converted into the thriving man—when he acquires some stake in existence, he does not always drink, though he may have always the opportunity. Mr. Laing, in his *Residence in Norway* already quoted, remarks a similar coincidence of sobriety with cheap spirits in that country; and his opinion, grounded thereon, is, that free distillation and the total absence of duty on spirits, would be beneficial to Ireland. "The effect would be," says Mr. Laing, "that every body in Ireland would be drunk for a fortnight, after which there would be order and sobriety." Looking at America, we quite agree with Mr. Laing in his opinion that free distillation would be beneficial, but at the same time, we cannot conceal from ourselves, that while misery—the offspring of a vicious social system—remains, in-sobriety will remain also. As by means of a series of reforms, the condition of the Irish peasantry is improved, the class of drinkers will be narrowed, till at last it will be confined to the

outcast population, whilst among the mass, drunkenness will be as rare as in America. Where intoxication, however, is indulged, as in America, it soon destroys. A drunkard's case is there hopeless; there is no check to indulgence; a speedy death is inevitable. Extreme cases, however, are always rare, and they are generally to be traced to general misfortune and improvidence.

We have done. In a brief space we have endeavoured to throw together a few facts, to show that to the industrious Irishmen, and in short to the industrious of all other countries, there is hope in the New World.

ART. IX.--1. *A Christian Peace Offering; being an Endeavour to abate the Asperities of the Controversy between the Roman and English Catholic Churches.* By the Hon. Arthur Philip Perceval, B. C. L., Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty, Rector of East Horseley, and late Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. 1829.

2. *The Roman Schism Illustrated, from the Records of the Catholic Church.* By the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, B. C. L. 1836.

THE former of these works was published about the time of the passing of the Emancipation Bill. Its object is explained by its title. Reviewing *seriatim* those tenets and practices of the Catholic Church, at which the members of the Establishment take umbrage, it shows, that with regard to many of them, the strangest misconception prevails; and contends, with respect to the remainder, that if several are erroneous, and some few absolutely indefensible, they are not prejudicial to the salvation of those who conscientiously adhere to them:* that our Church is a true and apostolic branch of the Catholic Church, the elder sister of the English one; preserving many things which the younger would do well to recover, and would have willingly retained;† and exhibiting the power of grace, in the piety, generous self-devotion, zeal for the spread of the Gospel in every clime, and other eminent virtues of her children.‡ So that, the author conceives, “with one or two exceptions, the differences between the Churches, are such as may safely and fairly be left to each individual, without impugning the purity or truth

* P. 9.

† Pp. 74, 86, 88.

‡ P. 139, and sq.

of our religion.* And although he feels most devotedly attached to the Anglican Church, it is "more in her essential, positive, and eternal character of Catholic, than in her accidental, conditional, and temporary one of Protestant."† In fact, he regards it as indisputable, that if the Church of Rome had been, three centuries ago, what it is now, the Reformation would never have taken place.‡ In most points of importance, Catholics "have shown a disposition to meet the scruples and wishes of reasonable objectors;" and have modified, if not entirely laid aside, most of the things considered censurable.§ Members of the Church of England are called on, therefore, to extend to their erring brethren, who are joint-believers in essentials, the right-hand of fellowship. Let them, at least, refrain from lavishing opprobrious designations upon them; let them consider that the errors of many dissenting sects, and especially of the Socinians,|| are incomparably greater. Let them unite heart and hand with those from whom they have been too long severed; from whom, however, *they* never separated,¶ in protecting the holy and common cause of Christianity.**

The benevolent spirit *generally* exhibited in the work, of which we have just given an outline, is worthy of all praise, and by us, most cheerfully acknowledged. The author sometimes touches a jarring string, and produces a grating discord; still the dominant tone is kind and conciliatory, and soothing to ears habitually dinned with fierce and contumelious invective. Partialities and mistakes were to be expected in a work of this description, yet the tenor of the work might claim for most of them, a liberal indulgence. Not, however, for them *all*; and therefore, though as critics, we should pass with a light hand over inaccuracy of quotation,†† supposing that the author erred by implicit reliance on the polemics of by-gone times, as Catholics, we cannot but protest against several serious misstatements.‡‡

* P. 120.

† P. 118.

‡ P. 155.

§ P. 121.

|| Pp. 122, 161.

¶ P. 158.

** P. 164.

†† We could allege very many instances. Take the following as a specimen: "Melchior Canus, lib. i. de Euchar. c. 34, p. 171. Then follow some garbled words out of a sentence from the *Loci Theologici* of that author: *Book the third, chapter the third*. Canus wrote no treatise on the Eucharist. Cyril of Jerusalem is confounded with Cyril of Alexandria. (p. 25 and 26 comp. p. 173.) St. Chrysostom's assertion on the uselessness of *preaching* in an unknown tongue (x. 323) is adduced as an argument against our *praying* in a language that is not vernacular.—p. 171.

‡‡ Take this example, p. 32. "The only sort of an argument which they (Catholics) pretend to advance in favour of their custom is... the fear lest any of the consecrated wine should be spilled, &c." We pretend to advance a great *many* more, as Mr. P. may see, if he will consult Bossuet's treatise on the subject, or even the Catechismus Romanus. Part ii. ch. 4, § 70, &c. We have primitive custom, the

It must have been these which caused the book to be "ill regarded" by the members of our communion,* if indeed our author be not mistaken in his averment of the fact. Certain it is, that from those of his own, "it procured him many a cold look, and colder suspicion, not unaccompanied, in some instances, with open vituperation, as though he were a Papist in disguise."† This is just what we should have expected. The gross ignorance of Protestants generally, and of very many of their clergy too, regarding our principles and conduct; the hatred, which not a few of the sanctimonious bear to our name, if not to our persons; interest, fashion, political partizanship, then raging at fever heat; these severally, and unitedly, would, in common course, entail upon the man, who asked for us a dispassionate hearing, a rebuke similar to that which Nicodemus met with, (John viii. 52). Mr. Perceval does not regret what he then did; although he conceives, that "in his anxiety to see justice done to us, he did us more than justice."‡ Our position being now altered, he deems himself more at liberty to take another course; as our attitude seems threatening, he has laid aside the olive-branch of the pacificator, and mounted a battery to assail us as schismatics.

All misgivings and reproach must now be hushed, and "the disguised Papist" received into favour. If eight years ago he did us "*more* than justice," he has now done us *much less* than justice; and this novel mode of equalization, this unequitable adjustment, will, we doubt not, earn him store of compliments from the orthodox. His book is characterized by almost unmitigated hostility. We are no longer brethren, but schismatics and heretics. The style is altogether polemical. One would doubt whether the two works had the same parentage; they have the resemblance which Demea has to Micio. Upon a closer examination, we find they have some characteristics in common, which are reputable to neither. We have now to treat with Demea; he will try our patience somewhat, but we shall endeavour to keep our temper. Micio would be better company, but we have no choice; all we can do, is occasionally to prevail on him to interpose between his testy brother and ourselves. We

admissions of Protestants, and many other arguments. Again (p. 37), he asserts that '*nothing* can be advanced in defence of the practice of using a dead language in our liturgy.' Let him read Lingard's Tracts, p. 27, 100. Moreover, we who teach the Catholic doctrine on images, "are obliged in our common catechisms to *omit* one of the commandments of the decalogue, lest our people should see," &c. (p. 40.) We have taught that doctrine many years, and have read Exodus and Deuteronomy often and often; and handed the bible to children to read therein; apprising them of that *stale calumny* which Mr. Perceval has reproduced. But enough on this.

* Roman Schism, p. 10.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

are here reminded of a very sensible question once proposed by Mr. Perceval: "When did harsh language and ill-names ever convince a man of his error? or abuse and reproach win over an opponent?"* If he had proposed that same question to himself in the course of his performance now before us, its character would have been very different. We wish to remember and abide by the maxim; however, he must not complain if, in repelling his offensive imputations; we appear to treat him ungently. "One language to a friend, another to an insulting foe." Mr. Perceval is in the latter guise at present, and we shall return him the proper answer; not vague invective, or coarse personality; or malignant insinuation, but plain exposure of his fallacies; strict discussion of the use he has made of his authorities; vindication from wanton and unjust aggression. We begin with a general outline of the work.

Its contents may be briefly described. It is a collection of decrees and canons of councils, (principally general) and other public formularies, with short historical notices, and copious remarks. The Greek and Latin originals are accompanied with the author's English version.

The work opens with an introductory discourse, in which, 1st. Exceptions are briefly taken against the œcumenicity of all councils, from the Deutero-Nicene, anno 787, to that of Trent, both inclusive. 2ndly. Suggestions (the reasonableness of which, with some modifications, we admit) are offered to both parties in this religious controversy, as to the adhering exclusively to authorized statements, and public recognized formularies. 3rdly. The position of the Church of England as to our distinctive doctrines, is stated to be as follows:—She bears witness against them in her articles, but does not (so at least our author labours to prove, "against some later writers on the English side,") hold the doctrines in question to be fundamental errors. "Neither at baptism nor confirmation does she require an opinion on these points; nor when converts come over to her from Rome, has she authorized her ministers to make a disavowal of belief, in respect to them, a term of communion."† 4thly. Now, unless the Church of Rome can show her peculiar tenets to be necessary to saving-faith, she is guilty of the sin of schism, in imposing terms of communion arbitrarily and unwarrantably. And, 5thly. The *proof* of this necessity is incumbent on her, and (supposing it to be producible at all) must be ready at hand; if not in holy writ, at least, in the records of tradition. If her advocates fail in producing it, then "they are witnesses

* P. Offering, p. 120.

† P. 22.

against themselves, that they are teaching for necessary Christian truths, doctrines which they can produce no authority for so teaching, from either of those sources from which alone they themselves affirm Christian truth is to be derived."* 6thly. That "the term schismatical, is applicable in a particular sense," to us British and Irish Catholics, our author argues, from the interpretation which he affixes to certain canons of the ancient Church; from the fact, that the British (Protestant) Bishops do not require unwarrantable terms of communion; and from the position that the succession of our hierarchy, whether in Great Britain or *Ireland*, is broken. Our Bishops are therefore of foreign stock; intruders, whose acts are invalid, and whom the canons order to be punished.†

Several of these positions cannot be discussed, till the testimonies adduced in the body of the work have been examined. The last of them, must be to many of our readers so very startling, that, to afford them time to recover from the shock, we will turn back to the commencement of the introduction, which we have just faithfully epitomized. The author is anxious to convince "every person, that the decrees set forth, (in his book) are not dead letters, . . . but form, in part, the obligation of the priesthood, and the term of communion in the Roman Church."‡ Admitting the authority of the councils in question, "the Bishops of the Roman communion, and the Churches under them, (the *laity* we suppose) must needs receive the decrees of these councils, however novel, monstrous, and self-contradictory, with the same feeling of implicit reverence, with which the rest of the Catholic Church (*i. e.* Protestants) are taught to receive the deep things contained in the books of the Sacred Scriptures."§ We may as well remark, in passing, the fallacy which lurks under this representation. Here is a collection of dogmatical definitions and disciplinary rules. Of the latter, many have reference only to peculiar circumstances and times. That they are inapplicable at the present day is obvious, for they could not be carried into effect.|| As *teachers*, the assessors of councils propounded doctrines. As *legislators*, they framed enactments. Is Mr. Perceval prepared to deny legislative competence to the pastors of the Christian Church? We suppose not. Can he find any

* P. 25.

† P. 31, 33.

‡ P. 12.

§ Ibid.

|| Let us suppose Mr. Perceval, or his diocesan, to have a dispute with his Grace of Canterbury. The ninth canon of Chalcedon will tell us how it is to be settled. "Let him have access either to the exarch of the diocese (*who is he?*), or to the throne of the Imperial Constantinople, and let it be *there* judged." (p. 42.) Yet "the style and *authority* of a general synod has been allowed by the whole Church to this council." (p. 13.)

example of a wise legislature, inflexibly insisting on its laws once passed, without derogation, or repeal, or modification? The law given by the Most High himself, was qualified, in order to meet exigencies, and adapt it to circumstances.* Injunctions given by our Blessed Lord, were subsequently superseded by others from the same venerable authority.† The distinction between doctrinal decisions, and disciplinary constitutions, being so obvious and palpable, how could Mr. Perceval overlook it? And where is his candour in leading his readers to suppose of the whole, what can be said only of a part?

For the purpose of "*convincing*" his readers of that which has no foundation in fact, he annexes to his introduction sundry documents. There are several *petites bévues* even here, which we advise him to rectify. He quotes as an extract, from the *Bulla Cænæ*, that which is no part of it. He affirms that the *Bulla Cænæ* is published at Rome every Maunday Thursday. The "publication" has been suspended since the time of Clement XIV. He exhibits at full length "the oath required by a Bishop at his consecration, according to the usage of the Church of Rome,"‡ though he ought to have known and informed his readers, that the oath has long since been curtailed and modified by Rome herself, to prevent misconception; and that, in this *altered* state, it is taken by the Bishops of these Islands.§ Allowing, with Dr. Doyle,|| that there is nothing "very amiable" in this oath, we believe it need not fear a comparison with those taken in Bow Church. On "the authorized form of reconciling a convert," we shall say no more, than that the rehearsing of Pope Pius's *Profession* is a local *custom*, not a universal practice; unexceptionable, in our humble judgment, and laudable; enacted however, by no general church-law. Mr. Perceval may turn to the Roman Ritual and Pontifical. We retain the title

* Compare Leviticus xvii. 1. *seq.* with Deut. xii, 15, 20. and see Michaelis' Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, *passim*.

† Matthew x. 5. compared with xxviii. 19. We should be glad to know why that purely scriptural Church, the Anglican, does not see to the observance of *all* things enjoined, Acts xv. 29. They are indiscriminately declared to be "*necessary things*." verse 28.

‡ P. 38.

§ Dr. Doyle's Evidence, 1825. Murray's Ed. p. 386, 553. "There was one expression in it (the oath) which seemed to give offence.... The word *persequar* was understood by persons differing from us, as if it imposed an obligation upon us, by the oath, to persecute in the ordinary meaning of the word. [Mr. Perceval is one of these; for (p. xl.) he translates '*persecute and attack*!'] The meaning which we attributed to it was only to follow up by argument, and convince if we could by proof. However, as it was an ambiguous expression, it was struck out of the oath." There are other clauses omitted.

|| Dr. Doyle ubi supra, p. 386.

of *Profession*,* whilst Mr. Perceval (p. 33-37) substitutes the designation of *Creed*. The distinction is not very material in our eyes, but of vast importance to him; as it furnishes him with the opportunity of setting the Pope in arms against the Council of Ephesus. Whether his precipitate ardour to gain this idle and imaginary triumph, may not compromise his own Church, which retains a *creed* composed, in all probability, subsequent to that council, (A.D. 431) we leave himself to determine.†

We now address ourselves to the body of the work. Part the First, professes to exhibit "the testimony of the general councils of the first seven centuries." That the modern Church of England admits, at least, the first four general councils is proved by an *Act of Parliament*, the best voucher certainly, for a churchman of the present day; that "the ecclesiastical legislature" at earlier periods, received those four and two succeeding ones, is evinced by quoting canons of domestic councils. The inference is, that the Anglicans admit the first six councils, styled general by the Catholic world. Our author is not disposed "to enter into the question, as to the proper degree of deference to be paid to a general council,"‡ but flatters himself that he has proved, that "these solemn assemblies furnish one uniform, consistent, and continuous body of evidence against the Church of Rome;"§ that "whatever this Church has that is Catholic, she has in common with the Church of England; and that in whatever points she differs from the Church of England, she has herself departed from the primitive, orthodox, Catholic, and apostolic standard."||

The "ecclesiastical legislature" of England, admitted other councils as general, besides the first six;¶ hence Mr. Perceval's limitation is altogether arbitrary. However, let this pass. The conciliar decrees of the first seven centuries, bear decisive evidence against us. This is what he has undertaken to prove. And how? By confounding ecclesiastical regulations with

* *Symboli naturam etsi non nomen habet Professio Fidei quam Pius IV ex decretis Trid. præscripsit.*—Dens ii. § 24.

† The Creed of St. Athanasius; which the Church of England tells us "ought thoroughly to be received and believed." (Art. viii.) That the venerable bishop of Alexandria was not its author, is, however, universally allowed. To whom, then, or to what period, is it to be ascribed? To Hilary of Arles, according to Waterland. (*Crit. Hist.* ch. 8.) But, according to Tomline, whose statement we believe to be nearly accurate here, "it was never heard of till the sixth century.... it had never the sanction of any council, and it is doubtful whether it was ever admitted into the Eastern Church."—Elem. ii. 219.

‡ P. 13.

§ P. 68.

|| P. 70.

¶ We will take the Council of Constance as an instance. We suppose it will not be denied that the English Church recognised this synod to be œcumenical. In the proceedings against Tylour it is recognised as such. Wilkins iii. 411.

doctrinal decrees; by setting provincial synods on the same footing with those recognized as œcumenical; by a tissue of mis-statements on matters of historical fact; by gratuitous and illogical inference.

Let us begin by testing his accuracy as an historian. He has guardedly "disclaimed a familiar acquaintance with many of the authors whose works he has cited;" the work "having been undertaken, and pursued apart from books, except the few that his own collection furnished."* This is said as an excuse for incompleteness or inaccuracy. Now, we are not inclined to attribute motives; and therefore, we shall abstain from charging the writer with intentional perversion of truth. If, however, Mr. Perceval's evidence shall be shown at utter variance with historical documents when confronted with them; if the contradiction be such as materially to affect the questions at issue, his act of accusation falls to the ground.

Now, what he has deeply at heart, in this first portion of his work, is to overturn the supremacy of the See of Rome. It may be thought of some importance to ascertain who presided at the first general council. Our author shall answer in his own words:—

"The Bishop of Rome, by reason of infirmity, was absent, but sent two presbyters to subscribe in his stead. The Roman writers do not hesitate to assert that these presbyters, together with Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, presided in the council; *an assertion destitute of all foundation, not one of the Greek historians making the SLIGHTEST mention of it.*"—p. 18.

We know not whom it may please Mr. Perceval to admit into his class of Greek historians; but we should think that Gelasius of Cyzicum, may fairly be allowed to enter. He wrote a History of the Council; he wrote in Greek, and Mr. Perceval has elsewhere quoted him as his *sole* and *sufficient* authority for the discourse of St. Paphnutius.† Now, Gelasius‡ has preserved a fragment of Eusebius, which is in direct opposition to our

* P. 35.

† We purposely abstain from discussing the truth of the common story regarding St. Paphnutius. We are satisfied that it is a fiction; but we will allow Mr. P. all the benefit he can derive from its being admitted as authentic. We will only ask, why he did not refer to Socrates and Sozomen? the former of whom represents the bishop to have disallowed marriages contracted by clergymen, both of whom declare the inhibition to be an *ancient* ecclesiastical tradition.—pp. 40 and 437. Ed. Vales. 1668.

‡ It may be seen in Labbe ii. 153. He quotes from Eusebius's third book of the *Life of Constantine*. There can be no reasonable doubt on the authenticity of the passage; though Gelasius has in one particular misunderstood it.—See Valesius, p. 221.

author's statement. St. Athanasius, an eye-witness of the proceedings, a participator in the acts of the council, may surely rank as a Greek historian. And he repeatedly* assures us of the fact of the venerable Osius presiding. It will not be pretended that Osius was the representative of the Emperor. The actual appearance of Constantine at the council, and his demeanour thereat, are sufficient to obviate this supposition.† The bishop's previous mission to Alexandria by the Emperor, is altogether irrelevant to the question. Nor was the presidency a personal distinction, awarded by the fathers in consideration of the legate's personal merits. Great as these undoubtedly were, there were others,‡ whose learning, eloquence, influence, holiness, miraculous powers, would have obtained them the precedence, had not the Bishop of Cordova been the representative of Rome. His two associates, moreover, though but presbyters, rank in Socrates' enumeration,§ before any of the Eastern Patriarchs.

The Council of Sardica, in Illyricum, celebrated twenty-two years after, may be regarded (for a reason which we shall presently state) as an appendix to that of Nice. We are not concerned with the discussion, whether it may claim to be in every respect œcumenical. Certainly, if Mr. Perceval were its only historian, we should decide against its claim. For it was "a synod of western bishops, to the number of *eighty*." This is stated || on the authority of Beveridge. Will it be believed, that the eighty here alluded to, are the Eusebean faction, who, by previous concert, and on most frivolous pretences, receded from the council; formed a counter-meeting at Philippopolis, and subsequently circulated their decrees, under the borrowed name of Sardican? We must again refer to ancient and contemporary testimony. Sozomen and Socrates give *three hundred* as the number of fathers assembled at the legitimate council. St. Athanasius, who was present, warrants the computation.†† Mr. Perceval, however, reduces them to *eighty*!

* Ed. Par. 1627. I. 703. πάντων μάλιστα καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπιφανὴς ὁ γέρον ποίος γὰρ οὐ καθήρησατο συνόδου; καὶ λέγων ὁρθῶς, οὐ πάντας ἐπεισε; ποία τις ἐκκλησία τῆς τούτου προστασίας οὐκ ἔχει σημεῖα τὰ καλλίστα; P. 837. οὗτος καὶ συνοδὸν κατηγείται καὶ γράφων ἀκούεται πανταχοῦ· οὗτος καὶ τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἐξέθετο καὶ τοὺς Ἀρειανοὺς ἐκθύρξεν ἄρετικούς εἶναι πανταχοῦ.

† And see Athan. I. 840-845.

‡ Eusebius, Eustathius, Pottamon, James of Nisibis, &c.

§ Lib. i. cap. 13, p. 43. Ed. Vales.

|| P. 9.

†† "From the West about 300, as Athanasius says, from the East merely 76, as Sabinus says." Socrates, (101.) Sozomen (514) gives the same numbers without mentioning his vouchers. The long list of provinces given by St. Athanasius, i. 827,

The synodal letter of the Council to Pope Julius, who here also presided by his legates, is extant.* We will quote a short passage to show in what manner "the See of Peter" was regarded at this time. "Hoc enim optimum et congruentissimum esse videbitur si *ad* CAPUT, id est *ad Petri Apostoli sedem* de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes." And yet we are to believe that little more than twenty years before this, "prior to the Council of Nice, the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction extended no further than the lower part of Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Corsica, and Sardinia."† We do not assert, that the words above quoted demonstrate a plenary jurisdiction, as belonging to the Roman See; we are content to inquire, why such deference should be judged proper and fitting by this assemblage of prelates, gathered from every quarter, if within the recollection of every one of them, the Pope had only that narrow jurisdiction which our author has described?

To whatever cause we may assign the fact, the decrees of this council, (and indeed of subsequent ones also) passed by the name of *Nicene*. This is proved by existing manuscripts,‡ and by various documents of the fourth and fifth centuries.§ Amongst these canons of Sardica, there are several which confirm the power of the apostolic See of Rome, to entertain appeals from deposed bishops. The Roman bishop might renew an investigation, with the result of which a prelate was dissatisfied. Pending his decision, the see of the appealing bishop was not to be filled up. Were a bishop, deposed by those of his province, to enter an appeal to Rome, the Pope is requested, if he think fit to renew the inquiry, to issue a commission to the bishops of the nearest province, to hear and determine. And should the Roman bishop be requested again to rehear the cause, and to send a legate, who, bearing the authority of him sending, should determine, in conjunction with the bishops, it was declared competent in him, to act *as he judged fit*. "Erit in potestate Episcopi quid velit et quid æstimet."||

proves that this number is not overstated. The *precise* number must remain undetermined. From comparing the *details* given in the 2d Apology (767, *seq.*) with the amount stated (p. 818), it is evident that in the latter place there is an error in the numeral.

* It may be seen in St. Hilary's Works. 438 *seq.* Ed. Par. 1652.

† P. 48.

‡ See *Orsi*. *Istoria Eccl.* xii. 120. Tillemont, vi. 753.

§ Innoc. I, Ep. 23 ad Conc. Tolet.—Labbe II, 1282. Leo Mag. ad Theod.—Ep. 25, p. 115. Ed. Lugd. 1672.—Siricius, Ep. 3. Labbe II, 1028.—If the reader will attentively consult these passages, he will see that the "canons or rules" therein cited as 'Nicene,' belong to the Sardican or some other post-Nicene council.

|| See the canons, p. 20.

In the year 419, seventy years after this council, Pope Zosimus, commissioned his legates to a plenary council in Africa, about to be holden at Carthage. Their instructions, embraced, amongst other matters, the enforcement of the Nicene (Sardican) Canons, relative to Bishops' Appeals. Upon the requisition being read at the council, the members, whilst they avowed their determination to abide by the Nicene decrees, expressed a *doubt*, whether the decrees recited, were of the number.* It was suggested to write to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, to obtain authentic copies, and set the matter at rest; and to request Boniface, (who had lately succeeded Zosimus in the Roman See) to make a similar perquisition. The whole discussion, turned on the simple matter of *fact*, as is manifest from the language of the Fathers assembled. "Whatever had been established in the Nicene Council, they would all observe. Pending the examination of the archives of that council, they would observe what was stated as having emanated from it." Now, let the reader compare this narrative drawn from the acts of the council, (which are cited below) † with the account furnished by Mr. Perceval:—

"When the Bishop of Rome, Boniface, tried to *usurp* over the African Churches, by hearing appeals from them, he pleaded these canons (of Sardica) as his authority, asserting them to be Nicene. The African bishops having made inquiries concerning them, returned for answer, that no such canons were passed at Nice, and *peremptorily rejected his claim of hearing appeals, alleging that they knew of no canon of the Fathers, authorizing such a course.*"—p. 19.

This is certainly writing history in an *original* style. ‡ And the

* Labbe II, 1590, *seq.*—Alypius of Tagaste: "adhuc tamen me movet quoniam cum inspiceremus Græca exemplaria hujus synodi Nicænæ, ista ibi, nescio quâ ratione, minimè invenimus"....Faustinus the Legate: "nec vestra sanctitas præjudicat ecclesiæ Romanæ.....quia dicere dignatus est.....*dubios esse canones.*"

† Labbe, *ubi supra*. "Ut omnis postmodum *ambiguitas* auferatur."—After the reading of the seventeenth canon of the (Sardican) council.—St. Augustin of Hippo said: "Et hoc nos servaturos profitemur, salvâ diligentiore inquisitione concilii Nicænæ." Shortly after the whole council said, Omnia quæ in Nicæno concilio statuta sunt nobis omnibus, placent." And in the letter to Boniface: "Quod donec fiat (*viz.* the enquiry) hæc quæ in commonitorio supradicto nobis allegata sunt....nos usque ad probationem servaturos esse profitemur," &c.—Labbe II, 1672.

‡ Mr. Perceval may attempt to mend the matter, by alleging the espistle written about seven years later to Celestine I. (Labbe, 1674.) But he will not succeed. The latter argues strongly against the inexpediency of admitting appeals, and too readily sending legates at the request of appellants; and indeed the proved guilt of Apiarius, and the unbecoming behaviour of Faustinus the legate, furnished a good reason for this remonstrance.—Yet the *right* of entertaining *episcopal* appeals is not *denied*: though arguments, which will hardly satisfy any reader, are alleged against the practice of admitting any appeals from Africa. The language adopted is a clear evidence that the right was allowed. "Impendio *deprecamur*, ut deinceps ad vestras

author goes on to contend, that "as the African Churches had no less than thirty-six representatives at the Council of Sardica, the fair inference from all this is, that these canons are *spurious*." He forgets the intervening lapse of time; nor has he attended to the circumstance, that the assembled bishops' memory was so far from being quick and ready, with regard to the decrees enacted at Nice, that they only *doubted* whether the alleged and misnamed canons, were the offspring of that council or not. There are traces of the Sardican decrees in the African councils prior to this time.* As to Mr. Perceval's attempt to limit the appellate jurisdiction to Pope Julius, it is a mere verbal cavil—mere special pleading. The Pope's name occurs in the 3rd canon, the name of his office *only* is enounced in the 5th, (or 7th). He might have shown a little reasonable scepticism, by discussing the 12th canon of the Council of Antioch; or said something in defence of its disputed authenticity, before adducing † it as peremptory authority to overrule the canons of Sardica. He might and *he ought* to have quoted the whole of the decree of the synod of Milevi, A.D. 416. To understand the nature of an enactment, we are surely to inquire what persons it regards. Now, this decree imposes a penalty on priests, deacons, and inferior clerks, appealing to parts beyond the sea. The original says nothing on *bishops*.‡ But the question at the sixth Council of Carthage, turned on appeals made by the latter. What purpose, but that of deception, can be answered by adducing irrelevant and mutilated documents?

We unwillingly detain our readers so long in this early stage of our inquiry; but it cannot be unimportant to mark the

aures hinc venientes non facilius admittatis. Executores etiam clericos vestros quibusque petentibus, nolite mittere, nolite concedere," &c. That it was fully exercised is manifest from St. Augustin. Ep. 43 and 209. (Ed. Ben. p. 72, and 592, seq.) See Orsi's masterly digression on this subject, xii. 105, seq.

* In the council held at Carthage by Gratus. (Labbe II. 715.) Gratus recites a Sardican canon, the enactment of which he remembered. It stands as the fifteenth in the Greek acts of the Sardican council. Labbe II, 640.

† St. Chrysostom protested before a council (Soer. vi. ch. 18), that the canon was the work of the *Arians*. And the historian ascribes its origin to the hatred borne against Athanasius, by those who had leagued to abolish the belief of the consubstantiality of the Son. If this be true, Mr. Perceval is welcome to make what use he pleases of it.

‡ See the canon in Labbe II, 1542. We are aware that in Justell the canon has, together with some other immaterial variations, the clause "Sicut de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est." (Justell, Biblioth. I, 344.)—Our surprise is, that Mr. P. has not availed himself of this. But then, he would have had to show how it came to pass that during the dispute with Faustinus, these "repeated decisions" respecting bishops should never have been cited. Either, therefore, the clause is an interpolation, or its meaning is, that appeals to bishops from the inferior clergy had been the subject of frequent enactments—an assertion which does not affect the question on appeals of bishops to the See of Rome.

position of the Roman Church in the middle of the fourth century; its recognized prerogatives, and its services to the cause of Christian truth. Exiled prelates from every quarter found there a refuge and a home. In Julius, they met with a cordial protector; a steady vindicator of their common faith; an assertor of outraged truth and humanity. The "prerogatives of his Church," and "the dignity of his chair,"* enabled him to discharge these Christian duties towards his injured brethren, with the more effect. Who can read the letter addressed to the Orientals, without recognizing the apostolic spirit which it breathes? Or what man will bring himself to believe that the claims therein stated with such mild dignity, such calm protestation, are the arrogant pretensions of an aspirant to exorbitant power?† "Had the bishop been suspected of any thing of this nature, the Church here ought to have been written to. But, now, without having given us satisfactory information, and having on their side done as they would, they afterwards wish us, who have not condemned, to join in the sentence. Not such are the ordinances of Paul: not so did the Fathers deliver. This is a strange form, a new device. . . . What we have received from the blessed Apostle Peter, I lay before you," &c. Indeed, the history of Arianism deposes to the important truth that a visible head is necessary to the existence of the Church. Riot, disorder, insubordination, were congenial to the heretical faction; adhesion to one common head was the opposite principle of those whose faith was sound. The assertors of the Divinity of the *invisible* head of the Church felt the necessity of close union, and combined action with the *visible*. Those who impugned the majesty of the former, would, by natural consequence, deride the latter.‡ The tendencies of the two parties were opposite; the systems for their respective furtherance were, therefore, altogether unlike. If we descend a century lower, we shall find these antagonist principles in operation during the discussions on the Incarnation. Contempt of authority, and insolence to

* The very expressions of Socrates, 91. ὁ δὲ (Ιουλιος) ἄτε προνόμια τῆς ἐν Ρώμῃ ἐκκλησίας ἔχουσιν. . . . ὡχύρωσεν αὐτοὺς κ. τ. λ. And Sozomen (p. 507) having related that Julius, after examining the charges made by (or against) each of the refugee bishops, and finding them all to agree on the Nicene dogma, admitted them to communion, subjoins that *he* restored them, and *why* *he* restored them. δια δε τῶν παντῶν κηδεμονίας αὐτῷ προσηκούσης διὰ τὴν ἈΣΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΡΟΝΟΥ ἐκάστω τὴν ἰδίαν ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέδωκε

† It may be seen in St. Athanas. 1st Apology, 739-754.

. . . . ἃ γὰρ παρελήφμεν παρὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Πέτρου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, ταῦτα καὶ ὑμῖν δηλῶ καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἔγραψα, φανερά ἡγούμενος εἶναι τοῦτα παρὰ πάντων, εἰ μὴ τὰ γενόμενα ἡμᾶς ἐτάραξεν—753.

‡ Athan. i. 832-835, &c.

the representatives of the holy see, were linked with the heretical impieties of Dioscuros, and the other abettors of Eutyches at the *latrocinale* of Ephesus. At Chalcedon, the exposition of the Catholic faith, as given by the Roman pontiff,* was adopted by the council as its own dogmatical decree. Peter was declared "to have spoken by Leo; his successor and faithful interpreter had presided at their consult, as the head over the members, or a father over his children."†

"In this age," says Casaubon,‡ "the most abandoned heretics daily wrought on the Church the havoc which boars make in a vineyard. There were none to withstand their progress or to do the good cause a service but the Roman bishop. No one unacquainted with ecclesiastical history is ignorant that for many ages God employed the instrumentality of the Roman pontiffs to preserve the integrity of doctrine and belief."

Rome may, then, we suppose, be allowed to style herself "the mother and mistress of churches." Oh no! for was not the Church of Jerusalem *incidentally* declared by the bishops at Constantinople, the mother of all churches? Now, this discovery§ of Mr. Perceval is, perhaps, more unfavourable to his cause than he is aware. His Church is as much affected by that *obiter dictum* as is ours. If the *title* be equipollent in both documents—"the *professio fidei*" and the Synodical letter—the modern Church of England owes obedience to that of Jerusalem, and is schismatical in not paying it. Secondly; how will he account for the precedency enjoyed by the other three oriental patriarchates, and the comparatively recent establishment of that of Jerusalem *with the concurrence of the Roman see*,|| except by admitting that the whole branch of this ecclesiastical economy is of human, arbitrary, and variable regulation: an admission which seals the fate of his cherished hypothesis. But, thirdly; Mr. Perceval must allow us Catholics to know and to believe as well as himself, that it was at Jerusalem the Christian Church was first formed; that it was thence the word of God went forth to all the world.¶ In this sense Jerusalem *was* the mother of all churches. Rome, with which Irenæus, in his day,

* The letter to Flavian. Labbe iv. 343-357.

† Synodical letter, apud Labbe IV, 833, *seq.* In the Vatican library there is a MS. of this letter, subscribed not only by the three named in the MS. quoted by Labbe (840); but by sixty other bishops, with an intimation that all the rest subscribed it. On this MS. see Orsi xiv. 335.

‡ Exercit. in Baron. Ex. xv.

§ That he attaches no small importance to it may be supposed from his honouring this fragment of two lines, and its accompanying version, with a clear page. (p. 32.)

|| See Nat. Alexander, in Sac. v. Dis. 16.

¶ Luke xxiv. 47.

declared every Church must agree,* is the mother and mistress of all churches—as a directive and controlling power, (so we believe,) over all churches within the Catholic pale, has been intrusted to her. It is in this sense that the *profession*, adopting the words of the Councils of Lateran and of Trent,† applies to her that title. Can this be said of the Church of Jerusalem?

Our author is unmercifully severe‡ on “the Roman writers” and the Church of Rome, for refusing to receive certain canons of ecclesiastical *discipline* enacted at the first council of Constantinople, whilst reverencing and adhering to *doctrinal* decisions pronounced there. This confusion of two things essentially distinct, is one of his customary fallacies. In the present case, his invective is especially absurd. “The claim of a council to the character and authority of an œcumenical one, is to be determined,” he elsewhere tells us, “*solely* by the *ex post facto* testimony borne to it by the Church throughout the world in the *reception* of its decrees.”§ This is his theory. Well, the universal Church embraced the doctrinal decisions of Constantinople, but did not receive its disciplinary canons. What is there to justify the author's charging us with “playing fast and loose with *inspiration*?” (an expression, by the way, equally elegant and accurate,) or his reproaching us with “contradiction and absurdity?” But he has an important object in view. The third canon of the above-mentioned council provided “that the Bishop of Constantinople should have rank *next after* the Bishop of Rome.” This our author deems conclusive proof “against the claim of the Bishop of Rome as successor to St. Peter!”|| The logic here escapes our apprehension; but let us proceed. The Roman Church demurred to accepting the decree; and when a similar enactment passed at¶ the Council of Chalcedon, the Pontiff St. Leo, despite of the importunity of its delegates, the solicitations of the Emperor and Pulcheria, or the plausible arguments with which it was recommended to his *confirmation*,† refused to *sanction* it. This

* “Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiore principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est qui sunt undique fideles.” Cont. Hær. III. 3 Mass. 175. The original of the passage is lost; but there is little doubt that *convenire* is the rendering of *συμβαίνειν*. Now, we are warranted in explaining this word by “to agree.”

† iv. Lat. Can. v.—Trid. Sess. xxv. *De lelectu ciborum, &c.* Innocent I. equivalently applied the title to his see, long before. See his two rescripts to the Africans.—Labbe II. 1283—1289.

‡ Page 23.

§ Page 22.

|| Page 31.

¶ See Orsi XIV, 323-330.

† *Rogamus igitur et tuis decretis nostrum honora judicium et sicut nos capiti in bonis adjecimus consonantiam sic et summitas tua filiis quod decet adimpleat.* (αὐτοπληρωσοι το προπον) Labbe, 837. This language is as deferential as that of the

fact may serve to show the authority of a pope in the fifth age. And, fortunately, the letters are extant which explain at length the grounds of his refusal. The intelligent pope never supposed that a request to sanction a decree conferring an honour subordinate to his own, was a summons to abdicate his own office, or deny his apostolic succession. No. His sole ground of rejection was, that the canon was derogatory to the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, whose precedence had been fixed by the Nicene Council.* Not a word escapes him on the injury done to his primacy, though Mr. Perceval has satisfied himself that the canon had abolished his claims to it.

Our remarks on the early councils have run out to such length, that we have no space to comment on Mr. Perceval's statements respecting Honorius and Vigilius. We shall leave him to extricate himself from the perplexities in which the Chalcedonian canons, 9th and 18th, have entangled him.† These thorny questions are uninviting to our readers, who will be more amused, if not instructed, by the following exquisite piece of *naïveté*:—

“When Rome ceased to be the seat of the government of the world, even the honour allowed by the early Church fell as of *right* to the ground. Still, if the bishop of that see will content himself with *asking*, out of respect to antiquity, that the same precedence should be *allowed* to him, as was of old, there *can be little doubt*, that that request would be readily granted by the bishops of the rest of Christendom.”—p. 50.

These are words of comfort certainly. They were seriously penned no doubt: yet we own they appear to us excessively ludicrous. Should a leveller in some provincial print civilly invite a sovereign of this empire to renounce his rule and titles, and assure him he had little doubt that his liberal compeers would grant his request, in consideration of family ancestry, to rank as first commoner, the call and accompanying assurance would not be half so amazing or so droll, as this augury which

Council of Trent on a similar occasion. Compare also the request made by the second Council of Carthage to Innocent I. (Labbe II, 1534.) “*Ut statutis nostrae mediocritatis etiam apostolicæ sedis adhibeatur auctoritas.*”

* See the letters to Anatolius, Marcian, and Pulcheria. (Labbe, 843-850) The first may be described as a severe rebuke from a superior: the second clearly states the ground of the refusal: the third moreover annuls the canon most authoritatively. “*Consensiones vero episcoporum, sanctorum canonum apud Nicæam conditorum regulis repugnantes. . . in irritum mittimus, &c. per auctoritatem beati Petri apostoli generali prorsus definitione cassamus. . . ita ut si multo plures aliud quam illi [the Nicene fathers] statuere, decernerent, in nullâ reverentiâ sit habendum quidquid fuerit a prædictorum constitutione diversum.*”

† Page 56-61.

the minister of a country village gives of the future condescension of bishops (*his* amongst the rest), towards one, who, in the name of his Divine Master, "rules from sea to sea, and from the river to the uttermost bounds of the earth."*

A council held by a few bishops at Laodicea, about the middle of the fourth century, prohibited the reciting in Church offices of any private psalms or uncanonical books, and followed up the prohibition by an enumeration of the canonical books *to be read* (*ὅσα δεῖ ἀναγινώσκεισθαι*) from the Old and New Testaments. In this list, most of those books of the Old Testament which *we* receive, but which Protestants generally style apocryphal, are omitted. This Mr. Perceval considers conclusive against our Canon of Scripture. Unfortunately, his argument proves too much. For the list of the books of the New Testament, which (for reasons best known to himself) he passes over in silence, does not contain the book of St. John's Apocalypse, which Mr. Perceval is bound to receive no less than the gospel of the same inspired author. He will, perhaps, say that to *omit* is not the same thing as to *reject*. Very true: then it cannot be shown that the Council *rejected* the portions of the Old Testament omitted in its enumeration, *till* it be conceded that it rejected the book of Revelations. We leave it to his option.†

From the terms of a decree of the same council, limiting the Eucharistic offering‡ to Saturday and Sunday during Lent-time, he has drawn an inference against transubstantiation. "It is not right, (*expedient*?) says the council, *to offer bread* (*ἄρτον προσφέρειν*) in Lent, except only on the Sabbath (Saturday) and Lord's Day." Now for the comment. "I would simply ask, whether, if the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation and the mass had now obtained, any impartial person can suppose that the *sacrifice of the holy Eucharist* would have been spoken of as it is here?"—p. 56.

Mr. Perceval's mode of speech here will suggest a ready reply to his question. We ask *him*, whether, after performing the communion service in his Church, he would describe the solemn act he had been engaged in as "eating bread and drinking wine with his parishioners." We are sure his religious

* Psalm lxxi.

† We have reasoned on the supposition that these Canons are genuine. This however is a disputed point. They are absent from several MSS. (See *Auctoritas utriusq. lib. Machab. asserta adversus G. Wernsdorf*. Vienna, 1749.) The Church of England reads the "Apocrypha," in her public service, but does not read the inspired Song of Songs; and her bishops *tolerate* at least the singing of hymns which are equally fanatical and ridiculous. (See specimens in *British Critic*, No. xl.)

‡ The canon may refer not to the Eucharist, but to the *Eulogia* offered by the people (see Binus i. 1527); but we decline pressing this consideration.

feelings would revolt from such a description of "the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist." Modes of expression and customs vary with times and countries. *He* would not allow the communicant to stand or sit; yet the early Church permitted both these postures; the one as symbolical of our Lord's resurrection, the other as conformable to what took place at the institution. He would not administer at the same table at which he had just partaken of a customary meal, or make no distinction of vessels: yet the primitive Church had no such scruple. As with usages so it is with words and phrases. We read in the Acts xx. 7, that the disciples came together "*to break bread*;" we see nothing in the expression at variance with our doctrine on the Eucharist; yet we should not (unless in circumstances when the allusion to that or similar texts was manifest) think "breaking bread" a fitting mode of speaking at the present day, on the most sacred action of a Christian life.* Does the expression of St. Luke, however, contravene our tenet? The testimony of ages answers—No. Still less, then, can that of the Laodicean fathers be an argument against it.

Thus far we have reviewed the principal of Mr. Perceval's accusations against us, drawn from the seven first centuries. Time forbids our noticing many other charges; for every page of his commentary teems with imputation, and a volume much larger than his own must be written, if a specific reply to all his criminations be required. Our readers, we believe, will be satisfied that this portion of the work exhibits no small store of historical inaccuracies and unwarrantable assumptions. Now, what must the superstructure be, when the foundations are so rotten? When our prosecutor is self-contradictory, and his allegations are belied by his own witnesses, what must be the fate of his bill of indictment? A singular change has come over our author since the year 1829. The Church-political war-whoop, seems not only to have stunned his ears, but disturbed his judgment. The insane root of faction has taken his understanding prisoner. There was a certain obliquity in his views before; but it was occasional only, now it is habitual. He has become cross-grained, partial, undiscerning, and sple-netic. We are sorry to observe it; but we must remind him, that a work executed in this frame of mind, is not calculated to "promote the cause of that peace and union for which our Master prayed, and of that charity which he appointed to be the distinguishing virtue of his followers."—*Preface*, xxxvi.

* "The holy bread of eternal life"—"the bread of heaven"—"daily bread"—"supersubstantial bread"—and the like scriptural forms, are nevertheless frequent in our liturgical and devotional books.

The second part is in exact keeping with the first; or rather, is more profuse than the former in criminations and scoffs, and exhibits greater perversions of fact and testimony. We have neither time nor inclination to notice the whole of them; nor on the questions which we shall touch, is it our purpose to enter into a formal vindication of Catholic doctrine and practice. Others have performed and will perform this task; our engagement is to show that Mr. Perceval is a false accuser. Let us begin with the question on the use and veneration of images. As his work is not a mere reprint of certain public instruments and formularies, but professes to exhibit historical facts in illustration of them, and to put the reader in possession of the state of the case as it comes before him for judgment, why did he omit—first, all notice of the practice of the early Church; secondly, all notice of the character, views, and methods of the impugnors of prevalent belief and custom; thirdly, all notice of those particulars which would ascertain what regard is due to the Council of Constantinople, where Iconoclasm triumphed? That these are considerable omissions will soon be made evident, and the reader will infer that they were designed, and that Mr. Perceval had recourse to *suppression* for the purpose of deception.

1. The use of images and pictures, although far less general in the ancient than in the present Church, was by no means rare. The discovery of figures of saints in the tomb of Priscilla, the mother of Pudens, which took place in 1578, and is recorded by Baronius,* as well as later investigations appealed to by Orsi,† are ample vouchers for this assertion. Tertullian‡ and St. Jerome§ allude to the custom of representing the Good Shepherd, or the apostles, on cups and chalices. A picture of St. Paul had left so lively an impression on the mind of St. Ambrose, that he judged an apparition to be like him.|| The picture was probably ancient, and supposed authentic. The sarcastic author of the *Philopatris* has given a description of the apostle's person, which agrees with excavated records.¶ And Eusebius** had seen pictures of Christ and the Apostles Peter and Paul, which he avers to be of a date contemporary with the blessed persons they represented. He was also†† an eye-witness of a statue of Christ, erected long before at Pancas, which represented him as receiving the supplication of the woman cured of the issue of

* Ad. an. 57, n. 112.

† Istoria Eccl. i. 265.

‡ De Pudic. cap. 10, p. 563. Ed. Rig.

§ In Jonæ Prophetæ, cap. iv.

|| Ep. 53. In the Roman Ed. The Benedictines, however, question its genuineness. Yet St. Austin's statement, vii. 502, is an argument in its favour.

¶ Orsi, 266.

** Hist. E. vii. 18, p. 263.

†† Ib.

blood. (Mark v.) The fear of being confounded with the heathens, to whom they bore no proportion in numbers—abomination of that idolatry from which they had lately emerged, and into which the weak and ignorant might relapse; in some instances, perhaps, the reasonable apprehension that these religious memorials would be outraged by the persecutors;* these are satisfactory reasons why, on the whole, comparatively few emblems of this nature, in some places absolutely none, were admitted. It was with holy pictures and images as with holy places. "Man was considered the best image of his God; a small building was ill-suited to the Divinity, when the whole universe was too small a temple for his immensity." Such is the view taken by Octavius in the celebrated dialogue of Minutius Felix,† and those who allege the practice of the primitive Church against holy images, would do well to consider whether it be not equally conclusive against setting apart places for religious worship. When Christianity had gained peaceable settlement, churches arose, richly adorned and furnished with statues and paintings. These erections and embellishments were, however, not the work of a day, nor were they simultaneous in every country. In fact, religion does not consist in them, though they are its evidences and useful auxiliaries. The Catholic faith needs for its existence neither a blessed nor consecrated place of worship, nor a crucifix, nor a picture. The Catholic Church could dispense with one and all of them.‡ Her disciplinary regulations determine the *use* of these and such like things, which may and do vary according to circumstances, local and temporary. As to doctrine, it is otherwise. We hold it lawful to make and to honour the images and pictures of Christ and his saints; we hold it to be profane to treat them with disrespect or wantonly to destroy them, when their use is permitted by the Church: we hold it to be false that the honour referred to the prototype, when we kneel before the representation thereof, is in any sense idolatrous, and anathematize an assertion of this nature as a wicked error.

There are some (and Mr. Perceval may be of the number)

* This we take to be the purpose of the thirty-sixth canon of the council of Eliberis, which has been the theme of so much discussion. "*Placuit picturas in Ecclesiâ esse non debere; ne quod colitur, et adoratur, in parietibus depingatur.*" (Labbe I, 974.) No mention is made of images: pictures on walls could not be protected from the insults of infidels. If the reader be not satisfied with this construction, which we have borrowed from the learned cardinal Gotti (Verit. Rel. Chr. II, 326), and which appears to us the most obvious; let him read the note of the judicious Aubespîné on the canon in question. (Ib. 998.) Certain it is that this synod of nineteen bishops affords no conclusive testimony against the practice of the Catholic Church.

† P. 104. Ed. Oxon. 1631.

‡ See Petavius De Incarn. xv. 13.

who contend that the use and allowableness of *pictures* and of *images* rest on distinct grounds; who are tolerant to the pencil, but inexorable to the chisel. We should be glad to know the reason of this distinction. In the divine law, (which, on *their* interpretation, is peremptory against us,) no distinction of the sort is made; the *εἰκόλιμα* is prohibited equally with the *γλυπτὸν*. *Parium eadem est ratio*. Does the divine law prohibit the designing of a human figure on ivory, wood, canvass, or the like? The answer is,—no; except that design be for idolatrous purposes. Then, except for idolatrous purposes, the carving of wood, stone, ivory, or the like, is not prohibited by the divine law.

2. Who were the impugners of the belief and practice of the Church in the eighth century? what were their views and methods? Tertullian, we believe, drew an argument in favour of Christianity from the character of its first systematic persecutor, the monster Nero. It is an advantage to the cause of sacred images, in like manner, that their destroyers have almost exclusively been profane reprobates. At a period antecedent to that of which we are going to speak, the apostate Julian threw down the statue of our Lord at Pincas, to which we lately alluded. The Christians, as would be done by our Catholic brethren at the present day, gathered up the fragments and buried them.* An especial enmity to the images of Christ was borne, consistently enough, by the Manichees and the Phantastici. But it was in the eighth century that the fury of Iconoclasm had full scope. An Arabian caliph, instigated by a Jewish impostor; a savage barbarian, Leo the Isaurian, encouraged by a renegade bishop and plighted to Jews; his impious son and successor, whose profanity sorely thrills every Christian heart when he reads of it; these were successively the leaders in the unholy war. The first proceeded at once to destruction; the second disclaimed all purpose of this nature at the commencement; he would *raise* the images, to save the honourable objects from the indignity of a kiss! They were raised, to be speedily thrown contumeliously to the ground. All this was done despite of the religious feelings of the people, of the protestations of the venerable Germanus,† (who was ignominiously expelled his see, for his constancy in urging and adhering to tradition and immemorial custom,) and of the energetic remonstrances and condemnation of the Roman see, whereunto the persecutor had directed a specious and cajoling solicitation. We need say nothing of the inhuman atrocities which historians have recorded.

* Sozomen, v. 21, p. 629.

† See his life in Alban Butler, May 12.

3. It was deemed expedient to put a plausible show upon a cause which unveiled itself too glaringly by these enormities. Accordingly an assembly of bishops was packed at Constantinople, an. 754. The number of bishops was very considerable: but we might have expected that Mr. Perceval, in giving an account of their meeting, would have informed us that neither the patriarch of the west, nor those of Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem, were present or invited. In common consistency, (to say nothing of fairness,) he should have told us this; for the absence of the Eastern (Greek) patriarchs at the 3rd Lateran and 2nd of Lyons, are, with him, decisive arguments against the authority of those councils. (pp. 84, 87.) We should also suppose that the then so-called patriarch of Constantinople is to be regarded as an intruder and heretic, according to his favourite Antiochene canon. (pp. 23, 39.) No hint of this sort is given. We are dryly told, (p. 77,) that

"The style of the seventh general council was *assumed* by the synod of 338 bishops, convened at Constantinople by the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, in the year 754. They met to *offer resistance* to the grievous error of image worship, with which the Church at that time *began to be afflicted*."

No doubt as to the *assumption*, which the Nicene* has justly remarked upon in words which Ivo has quoted, and which Mr. Perceval has turned into a censure of Ivo's against the *Nicene*! (p. 75.) It is not very correct to say that the synod met to *offer resistance*; there was already a consummated act whose evidences might be seen in the wreck and havoc of nearly thirty years' course. The cabal was banded to authorize the violence or to put the colour of right upon it. Mr. Perceval would have his readers believe, that in or about 754, "the Church began to be afflicted with the error of image worship." We have seen for many years past another affliction and a grievous one, in full work—the affliction of the pious people, of the expelled and insulted patriarch;—to omit the savage murder of the twelve teachers of the imperial college.

The synod met, and decreed answerably to the will of their worthy master: the course of devastation, confiscation, and outrage, went on with increased speed, till Heaven relieved the world of Constantine. Now this synod it has pleased Mr. Perceval to enrol in his book. With much better show of reason, at least with equal, he might have given us the *Latrocinale* of

* Labbe vii. 814. Action vi. In a running commentary on the style and title adopted by the assembly at C. P., the document says: "*Septima autem quomodo erit, utpote quæ non concordet cum sex prioribus sanctis et universalibus synodis: omne enim septimum,*" &c.

Ephesus, the Council of Tyre, or the Council at the Oak. But to the point—his object plainly, (though not avowedly) is to induce the reader to imagine that the faith of these courtier bishops was the faith of the Church, and that what was twenty-three years later declared at Nice, was pure innovation. Now let him consider, or rather let the reader consider, (Mr. Perceval is, no doubt, already aware of the fact, but has omitted to mention it,) that many of the prelates who had betrayed their duty at Constantinople, testified their repentance at the ensuing council, and submitted to its judgment; that some were restored on their full recantation, others deprived; that whereas three of the eastern patriarchs and the pope were not admitted to the assembly convened by Copronymus, all were represented at least in that of Nice. The two assemblies, in fact, stand relatively to each other in a position similar to that of a revolutionary convention and a constitutional legislative body. The latter quashes the acts of the former, and deals with the participators and promoters of them leniently or severely, according to the degree in which they are proved to have been implicated. Mr. Perceval mentions the legates of Pope Adrian only.

We appeal to our readers whether the many omissions which we have thus supplied, do not warrant our charging Mr. Perceval with unfairness? His work is professedly of that class of writings well known on the continent, called dogmatical histories. (*Dogmengeschichte*.) He must stand or fall by those rules of criticism to which an historian is amenable. He is not at liberty to pick out some isolated facts to *make* a case: he must state the case *fully* and *fairly*. Much less is he warranted in wresting from their legitimate meaning the authorities which he cites, or neglecting the scope and context of writers, when that scope and that context materially affect the question at issue. Mr. Perceval has done so, as we shall show presently.

The Deutero-Nicene council, in decreeing the setting up of religious figures, painted or carved, and the adorning of vessels, garments, &c. with such-like representations, followed up this disciplinary enactment by defining, that the salutation and respectful *worship* paid to these memorials was not indeed that veritable *adoration* in faith which (adoration) is due to God alone; that the honour given to the image passed to the prototype,—the person represented being the object of the devotion outwardly exhibited. In other words, that no absolute, proper, and permanent honour belonged to the image or picture, but merely such as is relative; so that (to use the words of the council of Trent, which every one, we suppose, will admit to agree with that of Nice on the present subject) “by the images which

we kiss, before which we bare the head and kneel, we adore Christ and venerate the saints whose likenesses those images express.”*

Now this doctrine, our author pronounces† to be “simply a revival of part of the old Carpocratian heresy!” Charitable and considerate words these; and especially consistent in one who would admit us to his Church-communion, even though we still adhered to the tenet. He has attempted to bolster up this charge by quotations from St. Irenæus and St. Epiphanius. But before he undertook to institute this insulting parallel between us and the disgusting fanatics of the second century, he might have asked himself, Whether Catholics confounded the images of Christ with those of Plato, Aristotle, and the like, and blended the worship of the former with the latter? And, whether Catholics offered *sacrifice* to images or not? Mr. Perceval has seen our churches, witnessed our liturgy, borne testimony to the piety of the assistants at it,‡ so that his own knowledge would have furnished him with a ready answer, and he “would not have condemned the innocent.” His two authors depose to the perpetration of that two-fold impiety by the Carpocratians which we abhor from our inmost souls. And yet we are held to be the fautors and revivers of that impiety!

Let us now see in what manner he has applied his other patristic testimonies in treating on this subject. For brevity’s sake, and that only, we shall confine ourselves to a few instances. He quotes St. Ambrose, and we will quote after him, but will supply an omission of his, which determines the meaning of that Father: “Ecclesia inanes ideas et vanas nescit simulacrorum figuras, sed veram novit Trinitatis substantiam. *Denique umbram abolevit, splendorem gloriæ manifestavit.*”§ Mr. Perceval has omitted the words printed in italics. Probably they are quite new to him. They show plainly that the “simulacra” here spoken of, are not palpable corporeal images, but phantoms and illusions, (*i. e.* metaphorically, and according to the antithesis,) false doctrines. Our author need not be told that the

* Con. Trid. Sess. xxv. In speaking of the veritable adoration in faith, the Nicene fathers have John iv. 24 in view. Compare Romans i. 9, and see Germanus’ letter in the fourth action. The reader will perceive that we have preserved the distinction which the Greek text makes between *προσκύνησις* and *λατρεία*, worship and (supreme) adoration,—a distinction which Mr. P. has obliterated, rendering both terms by the same word—“worship.” We take this opportunity of stating, that we have not examined the *whole* of Mr. Percival’s versions in this second part; but that in almost every instance, where we have referred to his translation, we have met with some inaccuracy.

† P. 343.

‡ Peace Offering, 37, 139.

§ De fugâ Sæculi, i, 429. Ed. Ben.; compare his discourse against Auxentius, n. 32, ii. 872.

Latin word has more than one meaning. A reference to the context, might also have shown that the passages from Clement and Minucius do not apply, unless in the supposition that the works of Chantrey and of Lawrence are to be doomed to the hatchet and the flames; or unless he can show that Catholics honour a cross, because it is (or was) an instrument for the punishment of malefactors. It was a stupid calumny in vogue amongst the heathens, that the Christians worshipped crosses, because they were crosses; worshipped promiscuously those who died upon them; regarded Christ as the Son of God, *because* he was crucified;* a calumny resembling many of the vulgar charges against us in the present day. We answer as did Octavius, "*Cruces nec colimus nec optamus.*" We reverence the instrument by which the martyrs and their divine Chief suffered the punishment of malefactors, but we wish not to meet with a malefactor's end. We proceed to Tertullian. His argument is levelled against Christians who made idols *for the heathens*, and thus became partakers of their idolatry. To the *scope* of the passage, Mr. Perceval is perfectly indifferent. The words, he thinks, "destroy the subtle distinction which the Roman champions attempt to draw between images and idols." (p. 418). The mere words would do more. They would involve, in the guilt of encouraging the breach of the commandments, the right reverend and noble subscribers to the Duke of Wellington's statue. But what man of sense will attempt to argue from the words of a writer, without considering their intent and bearing? Mr. Perceval might very well apply the words of Tertullian to a certain Government and Company, taking Juggernaut under protection, and encouraging its worship. As it is, his inference is like that of a man, who, from a discourse on the enormity of mixing poisons for the use of murderers and suicides, should infer that the writer was an enemy to every kind of drugs; and (although he never once alluded to *medicine*) "destroyed the *subtle* distinction attempted to be drawn," between noxious and wholesome potions. Let us recommend our author to attend more carefully to the context and drift of the authors whom he cites. Had he done so, he would no more have brought St. Jerome into the field than Tertullian. St. Jerome is censuring the preposterous honours paid to the statues of the emperors: an excess which was sneered at by Julian and controlled by Theodosius. What has this to do with the decisions of the Nicene and Tridentine Councils? In return for the scraps which Mr. P. has picked out of St. Gregory's letters to Serenus,

* Origen contra Celsum, l. ii. p. 90.

we offer him the following passage, and beg of him not to imitate some of his predecessors, who invert the words, and falsify the venerable Pope's meaning :—" Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam prosternimus, sed Illum adoramus quem per imaginem aut natum aut passum, sed et in throno sedentem recordamur."* Such would be the language of the *present* Gregory, were he writing on the subject.

We intended to notice Mr. Perceval's statements respecting the Frankfort Council, but have been delayed too long on the Nicene, to be able to fulfil our purpose. We are about to enter on that of Trent, but before we proceed farther, we feel obliged to animadvert on a passage respecting the third Lateran (p. 128). The 16th canon declares, *inter alia*, that " those are not to be called oaths, but rather perjuries, which are contrary to the good of the Church and the appointments of the holy Fathers." Mr. Perceval exhibits a *fragment* of that canon, and heads the fragment with the following inscription, of course as a fair summary of its contents or declaration of its import. "*The fancied convenience of the Church of greater force than a Christian man's oath.*" Mr. Perceval—

" Ashamed, should mark that passage with a blot,
And hate the line where candour was forgot."

He has given his reader a fragment of the canon; had he quoted it entire, his calumny would have been too evident. Now, it appears that, in the twelfth century, it was not unusual in some capitular bodies for the minority factiously to obstruct the execution of the resolves of the majority. So states the canon† in question, and it proceeds to decree that the decisions of the majority should hold good and take effect without sufferance of appeal, unless the minority could produce some reasonable allegation. There is surely nothing unequitable in this enactment: what sort of a legislature would that be which should be fettered by a small party's caprices! But " the small party" in the case before us would allege, that their oath bound them to impede and frustrate the resolutions of the majority. Is there any man of common honesty who will maintain *such* an oath to be a lawful oath?‡ Has it the " judgment, justice, and truth," which the Church of England,§ as well as the Catholic Church, require as

* Ad Secundin. Ep. i. 12, 54.

† Labbe x. 1517.

‡ If it was the *authorized* oath taken (at their admission into the chapter) to observe the customs, it was a manifest perversion to allege that oath as a warrant for an unjust act: but a closer examination of the text of the decree will show that it was an oath to maintain abuses. " Si quis hujusmodi constitutiones quæ nec ratione juvantur nec sacris congruunt institutis jurare præsumperit," &c. This is the text in the Decretals. (iii. Ti. xi. cap. 1.) Labbe has placed it in the margin.

§ Art. 39.

the *comites jurisjurandi*? It was an engagement, which no custom could ratify, to do an unjust act. As such, it is condemned by the Council, and stigmatised as perjury. Let the Rector of Horseley talk as he pleases about "*ex post facto* benefit or convenience to the Church" (p. 346). He would denounce as perjurers any set of men who should combine on oath to obstruct him in the collecting of his tithes and dues. Of that we have little doubt. Neither would he refuse "the *ex post facto* convenience" to his purse upon such a combination being broken up. And he would tell the man who pleaded his oath, that it was "*not* a Christian man's oath;" and the *custom* of taking such an oath he would repute to be rather an aggravation of guilt than a palliative.

One word, in passing, on the 9th canon of the fourth Council of Lateran. We can readily understand why the Rector is so anxious to make it appear that no canons were passed at that assembly,* but we cannot discern his consistency in rating us (p. 351) for "playing fast and loose with the decrees" of this Council. The decrees and canons *here* are one and the same. If the Council passed no canons, what becomes of our *game*, or Mr. Perceval's *censure*? As to the canon in question, he has only repeated the strange blunder made in his former work.† It was enacted by the Council (and the canon was subsequently incorporated in the decretals‡) that whereas, in many parts, there existed within the same diocese, a diversity of rites and languages among the faithful, the bishop should provide for the administration of the sacraments and celebration of the service according to the diversity of rites and language. If there were urgent necessity, he might appoint a bishop of that rite and language, to perform a *vicarial* office. Any reader, moderately acquainted with the circumstances of the times, (a new empire of Constantinople had just been formed by the Latins) will at once see that this injunction regarded the languages of Greece

* P. 15 et alibi. How will he account for the almost universal persuasion to the contrary? The paradoxes of some few writers on this subject are overborne by the records of subsequent councils, the language of the Decretals, and other ancient documents. The Greek translation given by Labbe is in all probability coeval with the council. The passage which Mr. Perceval has quoted from *Platina* in one place (p. 104), and attributed to *Nauclerus* in another (p. 348), is not to the question. The war between the Genoese and Pisans was certainly some hindrance to the project of the crusade; and of this the historian is speaking; but what hindrance was it to a decree on the Trinity or Holy Sacrament, and other points whether of doctrine or discipline?

† Peace Offering, p. 35 and 136. He has quoted St. Gregory's well-known letter to St. Augustin (on the adoption of various *rites*) for no other purpose than to insinuate that the liturgy was celebrated in the vernacular tongue! Does he believe that mass was ever said in Anglo-Saxon?

‡ De Off. jud. ordin. Tit. 31, cap. 14.

and Rome, and those languages exclusively. The latter part of the canon, which is in fact the main part, and which Mr. P. omits, affords a clear warrant for this construction. It was in the East only that such a difference of *rite* and language existed, as to call for a regulation of this kind. From the canon we gather that there was a wish to establish co-ordinate bishops in dioceses where this marked diversity was found: the number of foreign settlers dissentient from the hitherto established rite must, therefore, have been very considerable. The idea of co-ordinate bishops, however, met with no favour; and if *one* vicar was allowed, it was only in case of "urgent necessity." No one who considers these facts, or the uniform practice of the Western Church for the three following centuries, will imagine that the Council intended to substitute the half-formed jargons of Europe for the Latin language in the Church liturgy. Mr. Perceval, a Bachelor of Laws, ought to have remembered the rule of his science.—"*Intelligentia dictorum ex causis est assumenda dicendi; quia non sermoni res, sed rei est sermo subjectus.*"*

We may apply to the portion of Mr. Perceval's book, which we are now going to comment upon, what Hardinge said of Jewel's reply: "The number of untruths and false parts rise up so infinite, that, (we will not say we are like to be overcome, but) perhaps, with abundance of matter, being loth to let foul points pass, we may be encumbered. Certain it is, rather do we find distress what to leave than what to touch, what to dissemble than what to refell, what to wink at than what to convince." Under such circumstances, we leave unnoticed all and every one of his misrepresentations on the subject of the Eucharist. The Canon of Scripture and the Invocation of Saints would require a longer discussion than we can afford to enter into: besides, the author has exonerated us from the task of discussing the latter question, by having justified our practice in his *Peace Offering* (p. 50-56), and on the former he acknowledges that the African Church received with one exception, (?) the canon which we adopt (p. xxi.). We address ourselves, then, to our author's notes on the Sacraments in general, and that of Penance and Extreme Unction in particular. Much, even on these topics, must remain untouched, however open to remark and easy of confutation:—a sufficient evidence nevertheless will be produced of Mr. Perceval's ignorance or insincerity.

* Cap. 6. de Verb. Signif.

Because St. Gregory* says, "*Sunt autem sacramenta, baptisma, Chrisma, corpus et sanguis Christi*, quæ ob id sacramenta dicuntur quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus Divina secretius salutem eorumdem sacramentorum operatur," and again, "*Hoc de corpore et sanguine Domini nostri J. C. hoc etiam de baptismo et chrismate sentiendum est*," Mr. Perceval concludes that he recognized no others. That is, he declared baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of Christ, to be sacraments; *therefore* he did not believe penance (for example) to be a sacrament. By parity of reasoning; because our divine Redeemer (Matt. xix.) enumerated five commandments, he did not recognize the whole Decalogue, or require the enquiring young man to fulfil any but those cited! The reader will suppose, however, that St. Gregory, in the passages cited, is a witness to at least *three* sacraments. Mr. Perceval will undeceive him: "*Here are only two sacraments recognized, washing and anointing being as much included under one, as the body and blood are under the other; confirmation or chrism being no more a sacrament distinct from baptism than the cup is a sacrament distinct from the bread*."!—p. 369.

The elements of the Lord's supper are bread and wine; but it was reserved for the East Horseley chair of theology to define that *water and oil* are the elements of baptism. At least the doctrine sounds new to our ears. We shall be glad to hear the judgment which that guardian of orthodoxy, the University of Oxford, may be pleased to pronounce on this dictum of "her grateful and respectful son." Meanwhile, whatever may be Mr. Perceval's practice, his Church baptizes her catechumens not in water and oil, but in water only. Yet, "chrism being no more a sacrament distinct from baptism than the cup is a sacrament distinct from the bread," it might have been expected that

* The passage is quoted from the Decretum of Gratian, part ii. cause i. q. 1, ch. 84.—How much of that chapter is from St. Gregory is uncertain: nor is it material to enquire. Gratian's thesis is as follows: "Non merita sacerdotum sed virtus divina sacramenta sanctificat." The signification of the words 'mysterium' and 'sacramentum' is laid down, and the applicability of both terms, more particularly of the latter, to baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of Christ, is stated. From the unity of the Spirit operating throughout the Church, it is inferred that the effect of the sacrament is independent of the merits of their minister, so that whether he be good or bad the benefit is the same to the receiver. The Eucharist, and Baptism, and Chrism, are enumerated as sacraments; and it is inferred, that as of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ ("than which nothing is better") we are to hold and believe as above stated, so likewise on baptism and chrism, because a Divine power mysterious worketh in them, &c. . . . Nothing can be concluded hence against the *septenary* number of sacraments: unless, by parity of argument, we are to conclude from St. Austin's reasoning (contra Parmen. ii. c. 13) that there are no other sacraments than baptism and order.

oil should be as much insisted on at baptism as the cup at the Eucharistic rite. "It is no more distinct." Now, *we* are mutilators of the sacrament and what not, because we do not administer the cup. What must the Church of England be, which uses water only at baptism? If anything could show the adventurous spirit of a polemic in its full light, it would be this example. To procure St. Gregory as a witness to the binary number of sacraments, the cup—whose administration is held to be indispensable—is brought down to an equality with that which is never used by the Anglicans for a sacramental purpose !*

After some remarks on our tenet regarding the necessity of intention in the minister of the sacraments, (remarks which show that Mr. Perceval is not master of the question he treats of) and a glance at "the many avowed infidels that have been found in the ranks of our priesthood," (kind, generous, and honest man!) we are told that "she (the Catholic Church) has placed the communicants at the mercy of the baker's and vintner's intention, and any malevolent person who supplies the wine and wafers to be used in the Lord's supper, has it in his power, according to our rubrics, to deprive the communicants of the grace of the sacrament." We might demur to this statement; but we will accept it as true. And we will put a question or two to our gentle censor. What element does he deem essential to baptism? Water at least, if not water and *oil*. Is it impossible for a malevolent person to substitute another fluid in the parish font? It is not impossible. Where, then, would be the baptism? What element does Mr. Perceval require for the sacramental cup? Unless he has attained to the spiritual light of some of his brethren at home and abroad, we suppose wine, and *wine of the grape*. The cup is, moreover, essential to the sacrament: without it, there is at best merely "half-communion." How can we appeal to any one whether "a fearful door is not opened to doubt and hesitation," when the adulteration practised by vintners is considered; a fraud which cannot be so narrowly watched when the supply is large. We need say nothing of the hands through which the wine is to pass, or of the practice (which we have good reason to believe not uncommon), of furnishing mere factitious wine to the communion

* That St. Gregory held confirmation to be a sacrament altogether distinct from baptism is most manifest from his sacramentary, (in *Sabbato Sancto*, p. 111, *seq.* t. 5. *Opp. Ed. Antw.* 1615), where the prayer of invocation is the same as that of the Roman Pontifical.—See also the 9th and 26th letters of the third book, t. 4, pp. 102 and 111.

table, and this, too, with the knowledge of the clergyman.* Now let the Rector of Horseley make his option. Wine of the grape is not essential to the holy sacrament, *or* the people of his communion may be, and often are, deprived of the sacramental cup (which is nevertheless an integral and essential part of the ordinance). Let him adopt the first, and we ask him for his warrant, and where he will stop? Let him take the second, then we ask him where is the reason in his diatribe against our rubrics? Questionless, there are malevolent men; there have been infidels in the ranks of our priesthood, as there was a *traitor* amongst those chosen by Christ himself; there *may* be among Mr. Perceval's brethren some who treat religion as a mockery:—still, as Mr. P. has told us elsewhere, "God's care for the congregations is greater than that of those to whom He has entrusted them: He watches over them to defeat the evil which would naturally result from the conduct of their responsible guardians."†

Our author conceives he has totally disposed of our tenet, that confirmation, extreme unction, and matrimony, were instituted by Christ. His reasoning is very compendious. Our theologians, and Dr. Doyle nominatim, confess that the precise time of their institution is uncertain;‡ therefore they cannot be proved to be ordinances of Christ's institution. There is more despatch than logic here. Will Mr. P. determine the precise time when our Lord instituted the sacrament of baptism? Our divines are not uniform in their answer to the question§: he will perhaps reply magisterially in a trice; but we can tell him he must be prepared to meet the objections which will crowd around him. The scholastic divines are less trenchant and summary than the rector; but they are better reasoners,—more wary, more candid. Whilst we are on this subject, let us refer to his inconsiderate bitterness against the *Catechismus ad Parochus*. That work,

* The reader must excuse these details, and some others into which we shall shortly enter. We are forced into them in both instances, in order to reply to objections which are commonly presented to the *vulgar* in rancorous tracts, but which an adversary who values his character should abstain from alleging. We may here add to what we have said above, that it is equally in the power of an infidel parson and an infidel priest to mutilate or suppress the *form* of the sacrament. Unless Mr. P. is prepared to assert, that no such mutilation or suppression can invalidate the sacrament, he must allow that the Protestant has in this respect no advantage over the Catholic. Lastly, before he repeats his summary condemnation of the 11th canon of Sess. vii. (p. 369), let him ask himself whether he believes that the mere rehearsing of the form and application of the element in *derision* or in *jest* would be conferring a sacrament? We hardly think he would. Now it was against *this* "monstrous and fearful notion" that the synod's anathema was levelled.

† Peace Offering, p. 37.

‡ Pp. 371, 384, 404.

§ See Billuart, de Bap. Diss. i. art. 2.—Dens, § 2.

excellent as it is, is not however a symbolical book.* And as it professes to draw from ancient ecclesiastical sources, we may say in its regard what the canonists say of Gratian's *Decretum* "What is contained in the book has that value which it would have out of it and no other. Quotations from Scripture, pontifical decrees, &c. hold therein that intrinsic value and import which belong to them; admittance of a doubtful or spurious passage invests such passage with no authority."† The *Catechismus* having been drawn up before criticism had demonstrated that a very considerable number of decrees were falsely ascribed to the Popes of the early ages of the Church, it can occasion no surprise that some unauthentic documents should have found admittance into its pages. These slight blemishes, however, detract but little from the value of the work, which, for precision, clearness, comprehensiveness, devotional feeling and eloquence, may rank among the best in ecclesiastical literature. We have made these remarks, that the reader may be better prepared to estimate the candour and temper with which Mr. Perceval criticizes a passage. Let us quote his words:

"But as if it were not enough to affirm, on pain of anathema, the fact of an institution which they are *confessedly* unable to prove, the *Catechismus ad Parochos* makes it a *lie* with a circumstance in order to give it more credit. 'A pastoribus explicandum est Christum Dominum non solum ejus auctorem fuisse, sed *sancto Fabiano Pont. Rom. teste* chrismatis ritum et verba quibus in ejus administratione Catholica Ecclesia utitur præcepisse.' And because this *barefaced* accumulation of unwarranted statements might stagger the simple priests who would be *at their wit's end* to make good their assertion, the Catechism suggests how this may be done, 'Quod quidem *iis*† facile probari poterit qui confirmationem sacramentum esse *confitentur*: cum sacra omnia mysteria humanæ naturæ vires superent, nec ab alio quàm a Deo possint institui.' Ordinary mortals would have said, the institution proves the sacrament: no, says the Roman Catechism; the sacrament (which we assume) proves its own institution, *which was the point in dispute*."—p. 371.

We are so accustomed to the bitter language of this minister of the gospel, that we do not resent it. All we ask for, is a fair construction of the Latin text. We do not quarrel with his intermingling his commentary with the quotation. Perhaps it was *system*, perhaps it was irrepressible anger that prompted him to interpose; however it be, our good critic has made *two*

* Mr. Perceval seems aware of this, p. 413.

† Devoti Proleg. § 79.

‡ Mr. P. seems to us to have interpreted these words as *ab iis*, referring the pronoun to the catechists not to the catechumens. If so, he has lost sight of the usage of the best Latin writers.

sentences out of *one*, and accommodated his punctuation accordingly. The change may not be very important, though the construction which belongs to the passage will more evidently appear, if the sentence be suffered to remain unbroken. Now the text avouches two things: the divine institution of confirmation, and the divine ordaining of a rite and form now in use. The second assertion is grounded* on a testimony, which, at the present day, will be regarded as unauthentic; *the first* was not only admitted as true by those to whom the Catechism was addressed, but regarded as demonstrable by evidence. The Catechism did not address itself to those who denied confirmation to be a sacrament; but to those who were to instruct those who *already* believed it to be one. They who believed it to be a sensible sign of inward grace, would readily admit its divine origin; might be readily convinced that it could not be a rite of human institution. They who admit that by baptism original sin is cancelled, and spiritual adoption and grace obtained, must allow baptism to be a divine ordinance. The admission of a rite to be a sacrament involves an admission of the divine origin of that rite. Will Mr. Perceval deny that it is fair to reason upon admitted premises? His work proceeds on the supposition that such reasoning is legitimate. Can he be ignorant of the fact, that the doctrine of original sin was often inferred from the rite of baptism; and that, vice versâ, the necessity of baptism is inferred from the doctrine of original sin? The method varies according to the opinion or faith of those with whom we have to treat. Were we reasoning with a deist, we should not appeal to the gospel as to the inspired Word of God; were we reasoning with a Socinian, we should not adduce the Athanasian creed as an authority; in reasoning with Mr. Perceval, we should not infer that confirmation was of divine institution because it is a sacrament, *unless* we had premised, or intended to give, a proof that it is a sacrament; but to a Catholic, who, believing the outward rite to be an established means of sanctification, ignorantly supposed it to be of primitive, indeed but human, origin, we should address the argument above given: *quod illi facile probaretur; he would readily acquiesce in it.*

It is a trite remark, that those who are most bitter in their vituperation of others for a supposed fault, are the very men who ought to crave pardon for proved offences. The reader has

* No candid person will hastily reject this latter assertion, because the testimony incidentally cited (*sancto Fabiano teste*) is not genuine. The assertion may be sustained on better grounds. It is evident that it is the *first* assertion alone that the close of the sentence regards: in fact, Mr. P. considers the *second* as "a circumstance."

seen how insultingly Mr. Perceval can make a charge, and with what reason he can support it: we shall now prefer an impeachment against him, which we shall substantiate, without mixing invective in our pleading. The Council of Trent (Sess. xiv. cap. 4) declares that although it may *sometimes happen* that contrition (as before defined) is *perfected* by charity, and reconciles a man to God before the sacrament of penance be actually received, nevertheless this reconciliation is not to be ascribed to contrition without the wish for the sacrament, which wish is therein included. Our critic (p. 378) infers, without limitation, "that contrition with the wish for the *rite* of penance will reconcile a sinner to God without the rite." What the council affirms to be occasional, he interprets to be universal: what is pronounced of *perfect* contrition he explains to be said of contrition in general. This is not very fair; but there is more to come. Mr. P. represents the council as teaching "that the *mere* fear of punishment is a sufficient disposition for attaining the grace of God in the sacrament" (of Penance.)—*ib.* Let us turn back to the decree. "Imperfect contrition, which is called attrition, since it is commonly conceived either from a consideration of the foulness of sin, or the fear of hell and punishment, if it exclude the will to sin and have hope of pardon.....is a gift of God and impulse of the Holy Ghost, not indeed as yet indwelling, but only moving, assisted whereby the penitent prepares to himself the way of righteousness.".....After citing the *Ninivites* as an instance, it proceeds: "Wherefore certain persons do falsely calumniate Catholic writers, as if they had taught that the sacrament of penance conferred grace without a good disposition on the part of the receivers, (a doctrine) which the Church of God never taught or believed," &c.....Let any one who can comprehend the meaning of words compare the council's description of attrition with that which Mr. Perceval has palmed upon it. The one can apply only to a *convert*, imperfect as may be his religious sentiments: the other would suit a parricide quaking with the fear of what is to ensue, but exulting in the deed of blood, and meditating how he may perpetrate new horrors.—Before Mr. Perceval presumes rudely to pluck the mote from his brother's eye, let him cast the beam out of his own.

Let us pass to what he says on confession. In his *Peace Offering* he speaks highly of its beneficial effects; of its promoting the interests of piety and true religion; and deplores the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline in this particular.* "It has fallen into such disuse, that while men refuse to confess to their spiritual guides, they too often leave the world without

confessing to God himself." The repelling (as is common) all idea of particular confession, is "a *fatal* pertinacity." Many "persist in the denial of sins which it is certain they have committed, and choose rather to leave the world with the smouldering fire in their breasts, and a *lie* in their mouths, than make any acknowledgment of any sin which they hope they have contrived to conceal." And in answer to a "hackneyed cry," it is declared *better be priest-ridden than pride-ridden.** This was the moral theology of 1829. In the interim, the rector, "old as he is, has put himself to school," and (seemingly) attended a course of lectures at Exeter Hall. He can now refer to casuists, to *Dens' Theology*; condemn the minute investigation of sins which passes in the confessional, and pretty plainly insinuate that it is a school of immorality. The checks the Popes have imposed on a nefarious desecration of the ministerial function, he considers too "feeble" to afford *any* security." All this mischief he traces to a compulsory system on our part—a system the operation of which, we take leave to tell him, he grossly misrepresents. *He* would only *encourage* the burthened sinner to relieve his conscience: thus "many a mind would depart the world at peace with itself and with God."

If Mr. P. choose to degrade his character, by trading with the O'Sullivans and McGhees, it is no concern of ours. But we must remind him, that he has not put the question on the right footing. If the Catholic believes that confession is the necessary remedy for mortal sin committed after baptism, he readily submits (if he value his soul) to the full disclosure of his guilt, whether of deed, or word, or thought. A judicial office is held by the priest: and that office has its rules. The priest's power is recognized to interrogate the penitent, that the disclosure *may* be—what the penitent firmly believes it *ought* to be—entire. It would be more correct to designate auricular confession in our Church as obligatory than as *compulsory*:—we apprehend that the *compulsory* system may more truly be said to be acted upon by those who, whilst they acknowledge that they have no authority to inquire, importunately exact disclosures from one who does not believe them to be enjoined by God's law; from a sick man, writhing with bodily pain, and agonized at the prospect of dissolution, to whom, when in health, they never proposed similar interrogatories. And why, it may be asked, should his refusal to answer be censured, since the confession is optional: or why, by this novel

* Page 74. In the same page we read that "the *sale* of indulgences, perverted as it has been, is still in some respects useful." What anathemas would our Horseley divine *now* launch on a Catholic who should talk thus.

and *unauthorized* inquisition, should a temptation to lying be put in his way. Look at the two systems in another aspect. Mr. Perceval would *encourage* the burdened sinner to relieve his conscience. Of what? Of sins which we forbear to particularize. The cases where the disclosure must be of this character are frequent. Well, here the Protestant minister and the priest resemble each other in their position; with this important difference, however, that the latter is under the solemn persuasion that he is acting as the delegate of Christ: the former has not this persuasion. It will hardly be denied, then, that the one is more secured from contaminating influence than the other. As we wish to conduct our inquiry with a Christian spirit, we shall not be seduced by Mr. Perceval's insinuations, to retort on the ministers of his sect. We shall content ourselves with observing, that the best things may be depraved by men's malice, but such depravations are not sufficient reasons against what is abused: that the existence of laws does not prove a multitude of transgressors: and that, as with some other accusations, so with the one in question,—it may be wantonly alleged upon the most groundless surmise, readily entertained by malevolent prejudice, and but with difficulty rebutted by innocence. The Catholic priesthood's course lies *per infamiam et bonam famam*, and they pursue it; they are reviled, and they entreat; they are cursed, and they bless.

It was our intention to speak of the *bond of secrecy*, which has, in fact, a close connexion with our theme. Mr. Perceval, who deplors "the scandalous prostitution of the office of confessor, so common, yet so systematic, in these days,"* (he is speaking of Protestant ministers betraying the confidence of prisoners in gaol), may rest assured that the *general* observance of *strict* secrecy is compatible only with a persuasion of the divine origin of confession. We could prove our assertion, but we are called off by Mr. Perceval himself to other questions relative to the Council of Trent.

It is evident from his construction of the 3d and 9th canons of the 14th session, that he does not understand what he has set himself to refute. In the former, the Council purposed to stigmatize the error of those who distorted the text (John xx. 23) to interpret it as a commission to preach the gospel. Has St. Cyprian given it that interpretation in the passage cited by our author? No. But he applies it to baptism as well as to absolution.† There is no conflict between his words and those of

* Peace Offering, 70. The whole passage will repay a careful perusal.

† "*Utrumque in interpretatione hujus loci recte conjunxit Cyprianus*," Ep. 73, says Grotius on John xx. The 73rd is the Ep. to Jubianus, from which Mr. Perceval has

the canon. For the latter does not restrict the text to the single sacrament of penance. No exposition save that which was *contrary* to the deduction on the power to absolve is therein reprobated. It is usual with our East Horseley divine to imagine that the assertion of one principle is overborne by another, if the two differ: the divines at Trent supposed two contrary or contradictory propositions necessary to such a result. Explain the text as referring to baptism, if you please, but explain it also as the Fathers are wont to do, as referring to penance also.

In the 9th canon, the Council anathematized those who should assert that the priest's sacramental absolution was not a judicial act, but a *bare* ministration of pronouncing and declaring that the confitent's sins *have been* remitted.* There can be no doubt (indeed, even Sarpi has admitted it) that the canon was intended to apply to the Lutherans, who considered the remission of sins to be obtained by a firm belief of their remission. The act of the priest must in such case be purely declaratory. But does an act of this nature answer either to the idea of loosing and forgiving, or to that of a sacrament, or to the form of absolution, whether in the Greek, the Roman, or the Anglican liturgy? In the two last, there is an express appeal to "power" or "authority." Power or authority, of what? Of declaring that to be done which has been done! It is downright burlesque and profaneness to interpret a commission, given in the terms and manner in which that contained in John xx. was given, as extending no farther than this. We are far removed—as far as any of our adversaries—from the impious notion that any man can of himself forgive sin. But we maintain,† that, inheriting from

quoted a mutilated fragment. St. Cyprian having recited the text, concludes: "Unde intelligimus non nisi præpositis et in evangelicâ lege ac dominicâ ordinatione fundatis liceres baptizare et remissam peccatorum dare, *foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aut solvere*," p. 124. Ed. Rigal. The "binding and loosing" must refer to something distinct from baptism: the *remissa peccatorum* is, therefore, not the remission of original sin,—at least, not exclusively. Compare the expressions in the sequel of the Epistle, p. 125 and 128.

* Will Mr. P. condescend to revise his translation of this canon and the punctuation? (p. 283), which must certainly convey to the mind of the mere English reader (or to any other reader who does not closely compare it with the original) a meaning in several particulars totally foreign to the council's intention.

† Precisely the argument of St. Ambrose: "In baptismo utique remissio peccatorum omnium est: quid interest utrum per poenitentiam an per lavacrum hoc *jus* sibi datum sacerdotibus vindicent?" (De Pœn. i. c. 8, p. 400, tom. ii.) A few lines above, St. Ambrose quotes Mark xvi, 17 and 18, and observes thereupon: "Omnia ergo dedit (Christus) sed nulla in his hominis potestas est, ubi divini muneris gratia viget." We quote this passage here as serving to explain a sentence which, as will be seen presently, Mr. P. alleges from this Father. As usual, he suppresses what would show the citation to be irrelevant. We give it entire. St. Ambrose proves the divinity of the Holy Ghost, from sins being forgiven by Him. After quoting John xx, he ob-

the Apostles the office of "ministers of Christ, and dispensers of the mysteries of God," the priest,—as in the sacrament of baptism he releases from *original* sin, and imparts the grace of God,—so in that of penance he looses the baptized penitent from *actual* sin, and imparts the grace of God. The act of loosing is preceded by a *self-accusation*; analogously, then, it bears the name of a *judicial* act, and the scripture texts warrant the use of the term. In short, if grace be obtained in the sacrament of penance, the priest, who is the minister of the sacrament, must be a co-operator: his function, then, cannot consist in *bare* declaration.

The quotations which Mr. Perceval has accumulated from the fathers, impugn not our doctrine, but his own fiction. Priests are ministers and dispensers, not masters, say they: and we with them. God alone can cancel iniquity: the Prophet declared this ages ago, the fathers repeat it, and we after them. But the claim of a *delegated* office and power may well consist with this profession. Otherwise, let Mr. P. show that Christ *could* not empower any one to forgive in his name. And if he will explain the *jus potestatis*, which St. Ambrose denies to be exercised by men, to signify *delegated* authority instead of *essential inherent* power, let him abide the consequences, and see his own Church condemned for arrogant presumption. For we read that God "hath left *power* to his Church to absolve all sinners, &c."* St. Jerome's lash might fall meritedly enough on some daring and ignorant pretenders of his time, but leaves us untouched: for this good reason, that their folly is not our Church doctrine. If Mr. P. will contend that the alleged parallel between the priests of the old and of the new law, implies that there is no difference between them,† we will beg him to try his principle of interpre-

serves, "Homines autem in remissionem peccatorum ministerium suum exhibent non jus alicujus potestatis exercent. Neque enim in suo, sed in Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti nomine peccata dimittant. Isti rogant, divinitus donat: humanum enim obsequium, sed munificentia superne est potestatis." (Tom. ii. 693.) All that we have given in *italics* Mr. Perceval omits.—We may refer the reader to a remarkable passage of St. Chrysostom on this subject. (De Sac. iii, 384, *seq.* tom. i.) οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἄν ἡμᾶς ἀναγεννῶσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἀπαρτήματα.

* Book of Com. Prayer. Visit of Sick.—Hear the learned Pearson (on the tenth art. of the Creed): "The Church of God, in which remission of sin is preached, doth not only promise it at first by the laver of regeneration, but afterwards also upon the virtue of repentance; and to deny the Church this power of absolution is the heresy of Novatian."

† The difference is clearly stated by St. Chrysostom, as follows: (De Sac. Ed. Montf. i. 384) "The Jewish priests were empowered to free from a bodily leprosy, or rather not to free from it, but to examine those who were freed: whereas these (i. e. Christian priests) have been empowered not to examine the removal of spiritual defilements, but to remove them altogether."

tation on a few texts of Scripture: John vi. 57, Ephes. v. 23, 24, for example. His producing this passage from St. Jerome, deserves our acknowledgements: we shall have occasion for it presently, and shall deduce some inferences which he will not easily elude.

The Council of Trent has anathematized those "who shall deny that sacramental confession was instituted or is necessary to salvation by divine ordinance, or shall say that the custom of confessing secretly to the priest alone, which the Catholic Church always has observed from the beginning, and does observe, is at variance with the institution and command of Christ, and is of human invention."

Mr. Perceval twits the Tridentine fathers for not remembering that "in the Latin Church, as late as 813, it was matter of dispute whether there was need to confess to a priest at all," p. 385. He then gives us an extract from the Council of Châlons, which he supposes to leave the whole matter to each one's discretion, and concludes with the sprightly question: "was Leo the Third asleep, that he could suffer such heresy to be broached and not denounced?" There is no need of supposing that Leo was asleep, good Mr. Perceval, but *you must have shut your eyes* whilst the book from which you quote was before you!

The 32nd canon of this Council of Châlons† condemns the want of integrity or full disclosure of all sins to the priest in confession. Because man transgresses sometimes by internal passion, sometimes by carnal frailty, it infers that both kinds of sins are diligently to be examined into, that the confession may be *complete* by the manifestation of both, to-wit that those things of which the body has been the agent, and those in which thought only is the offender, may be confessed. And because of the subtlety and frequent grievousness of internal sins, it insists on the importance of the confitent's being instructed how to make his confession on the eight principal and most ordinary vices.

The reader will admit that there was no heresy here to startle Pope Leo out of his slumber. The canon might have passed at the General Council of Trent. He will wish to know how Mr.

* Labbe vii. 1278. Compare canons 34, 38, 45, all of which ascertain the usage of confession, and canon 46, which with sufficient plainness inculcates it as preparatory to the holy communion. . . . "purificans corpus *animamque* suam, præparet se ad percipiendum tantum sacramentum."—Compare also Egbert's "Succinet Dialogue," written a century before. . . . "ut non solum clerici. . . sed etiam laici. . . ad confessores suos pervenirent," &c.—Wilkins i. 86.

Perceval has disposed of it? Disposed of it? By bravely passing it by altogether, never giving a hint of the existence of such a document! The ensuing canon he has honoured with more attention, yet with the prudent caution of *suppressing* that clause which explains its import and baffles his argument. The reader shall judge for himself. The 33rd canon, then, states that some assert that confession of sin is due to God alone, whilst others believe that such confession must be made to the priests. That the Church combines both practices; the former being exercised by penitential prayer, the other by fulfilling what the apostle James directs (v. 16). That confession to God expiates sin; that made to the priest shows how sins may be expiated. *For a gracious God sometimes gives health and salvation (to the soul) by the invisible working of his power, sometimes by the operation of physicians.*

It follows, then, from these words which we have printed in *italics*, but which Mr. Perceval has not printed *at all*, but very conveniently reduced to an &c., that the Council believed that the priest did not exercise a bare ministration of declaring the soul's health, but operated that health as an agent of God's appointment: consequently that the sacrament whereof confession is a part was of divine institution. "There were some who said that confession is due to God alone." These "some" were not the Council. That confession to God in prayer is a practice of the Catholic Church at the present day, who will be so absurd as to deny? That a penitent confession to God only may, on some occasions, justify the sinner, the Council of Trent admits, as we have seen. That auricular confession was practised in virtue of a scriptural precept, this very canon bears witness; and its predecessor requires the confession to be full and entire.

Where is "the heresy broached" in this canon? There was, indeed, a grievous error in those who made the assertion which the canon recites. But the error is corrected by the canon. Confess to God only was the maxim of the one. Confess to God and to his ministers was the corrective reply of the other. Will Mr. Perceval abide by this rule? We have no more to say. Will he reject it? Then how does the authority tell against us? He may talk of slumbering popes. *Infelix astutia! Dormientem Papam narras! Vere ipse obdormisti qui scrutando talia defecisti!* That the popes of the ninth century were fully alive to the importance of confession, is manifest from a homily which Leo IV addressed to all bishops, to be by them notified to their clergy. It is preserved entire (with a slight addition of

later date) in the *Ordo ad Synodum* in the Roman Pontifical.* This discourse enjoins the clergy to bring their flocks to confession at the beginning of Lent. We could retrograde from the ninth century to the second, and produce vouchers for the practice of confessing secret sins. We could fill our pages with the earnest exhortations of homilists and tractators, conjuring penitents to make a full and free disclosure of their lives, and warning them against the criminal insincerity of a half-confession, or the delusion that their sorrow, without the aid of the divine and healing rite, would retrieve lost grace. For the expiation of venial sins there are *other* means at hand.† And it is of *this* that the fathers commonly speak, when they recommend prayer as sufficient for the cancelling of sin.‡ On the remission of mortal sin they speak otherwise. They insist on prayer, on tears, on amendment, but on confession also. We will give one or two proofs. St. Austin§ regards the pretence of the adulterer who appeals to God for the sincerity of his penance, but applies not to the absolving virtue of the Church for his pardon, as a pretence subversive of the words of Christ; and elsewhere, he calls upon the man who is contaminated with any of the works of the flesh, (Gal. v.) to come to the Church authorities, and receive the due injunction of the satisfaction which he is to perform, at the hands of these dispensers of the sacraments.|| It cannot be said that canonical and public penance is referred to in these words.¶ Then, St. Jerome** represents priests as exer-

* The Homily may be seen in Labbe viii. 33-38.

† Con. Trid. Sess. xiv. cap. 5.

‡ Aug. Euchir. § 19, t. vi. 163. Sermo. 352. T. V. 954. Ed. Antw. 1700.

§ Sermo 391. T. V. 1054.

|| Sermo 351. Tom. v. 947.

¶ St. Austin has been treating of the expiation of sin in baptism, and that of daily, but not deadly, sins by daily penance. In the fourth chap. (945) he comes to speak of another species of guilt, for which he prescribes a different course of atonement. This is, severe self-scrutiny, sorrow of heart, refraining from the altar, amendment of life, recourse to the keys of the church. The pastors of the Church are to determine the satisfaction to be performed; and if the scandal of the sin and the utility of the Church require a *public* penance, the sinner should submit to it with humility. (The sins which St. Austin has enumerated were not all of them visited with public penance.) The sequel of the discourse shows that the Homilist had principally in view, not notorious sinners, but those whose guilt was known to few, or altogether secret. We may add, that the close of the discourse furnishes an unanswerable testimony on the necessity of confession. "Non enim sufficit mores in melius mutare et a factis malis recedere, nisi etiam de his quæ facta sunt satisfiat Deo per penitentiae dolorem, per *humilitatis* gemitum, per contriti cordis sacrificium, cooperantibus eleemosynis." What does St. Austin understand by the *humilitatis gemitum*? He will tell us: "Certiores sunt claves ecclesiae quam corda regum: quibus clavibus quodeunque in terrâ solvitur etiam in cælo solum promittitur. Et multo est honestior *humilitas* quæ se quisque humiliat Ecclesie Dei: et labor minor imponitur, et nullo temporalis mortis periculo mors æterna vitatur."—950.

** Ep. ad Heliod. in Eccles. cap. 10.

cising a species of judgment before the day of final judgment; as having the grace of healing the soul from a secret poison;—a grace which would be rendered abortive by the shame of confessing. In a passage which Mr. Perceval himself has quoted, the same father compares the ministry of the priest of the new law who absolves, to that of the priest of the old who inspected the lepers and pronounced them clean, after certain expiatory rites to which God annexed a salutary effect. Now, the priest of the old law could perform his ministry only on those who submitted to it; that *all* afflicted with the leprosy were bound to present themselves for inspection, is equally certain, as well as that a mere vague and general declaration of distemper was not sufficient. It is fair, then, to conclude from these words of St. Jerome, that he regarded specific confession as necessary for all suffering under *spiritual* leprosy;—for all bearing the guilt of mortal sin. No one can read St. Ambrose's *Treatise on Penance*, without perceiving abundant indications of the practice of auricular confession. We would not, in reasoning with a *contentious* disputant, insist upon the applicability of the declaration in the sixth chapter of the second book: "*Solvit crimum nexus verecunda confessio peccatorum*," but we challenge any adversary to construe the close of the ninth and commencing words of the tenth chapters* otherwise, unless he be determined to wrench words from their meaning at all events. The writer is speaking (§ 87) of those who, though not condemned to canonical penance, were nevertheless inhibited, and deservedly so, from receiving the Eucharist. To obtain admission to the sacrament of the altar, they asked for penance, urged the priest to give them absolution;—a condescension to such importunities is described as injurious to the priest and to the applicant, and the warning words of Christ (Matt. vii. 6) are cited for the prevention of it. The reasoning which the author adopts at the commencement of the tenth chapter, proceeds on the usage of private confession as a recognized principle: "*Cum te non pudeat peccata tua homini quem lateas confiteri*."† Mr. Perceval might have consulted this treatise when he set himself to examine whether absolution were a bare ministerial act. He would have found the Novatians maintaining that very notion which he has endeavoured to represent as belonging to SS. Cyprian and Ambrose. *They* professed to reverence God by reserving to Him alone the power of remitting sin. And how does St. Ambrose refute them? By alleging that the Church has a delegated trust, which it were profane to return back to the

* II. 434, seq.

† Ib. 435.

giver "commissum munus refundere:" by quoting the commission (John xx. 22), and showing how the Church fulfils it, and that she must necessarily fulfil *in the same manner* both its parts. "Dominus enim PAR JUS et solvendi esse voluit et ligandi, qui utrumque *pari conditione* permisit Ecclesiae utrumque licet, hæresi utrumque non licet; JUS enim hoc solis *permissum* SACERDOTIBUS EST."^{*}

This passage is somewhat more germane to the matter in hand than Mr. Perceval's truncated quotation from the venerable bishop's commentary on St. Luke. He has given a short fragment in p. 384, another in p. 386. In neither place has he considered the drift and purpose of the writer whose words he transcribed. St. Ambrose has been extenuating the sin of St. Peter's denial. He proceeds to observe, that the Apostle did *not* extenuate it, but accused himself, and grieved and wept. That we have no record of his words (of excuse) but of his tears; that we read of his tears, but not of his *apology*. "Lachrymas Petri lego, non lego *satisfactionem*."[†] But that what cannot be *defended* may be *expiated*. "Sed quod *defendi* non potest, *ablui* potest." The holy Father proceeds to dilate on the efficacy of tears, as supplying for speech, as intimating what shame dares not farther avow, as conducive to pardon, as *preparatory to prayer*. "Ante flendum est, sic precandum."[‡] If Mr. Perceval consider this passage, and one adduced from St. Chrysostom, (which we shall notice immediately) to be peremptory against the Council of Trent's decision that specific confession is of divine institution, he is indeed easily satisfied. The moderation of his desires with respect to evidence is, indeed, very exemplary here. His demands on the sinner are also very circumscribed. But a little while ago, he was contending for the expediency of an occasional verbal confession: *now*, we are to believe that the whole business of the sinner's reconciliation is accomplished by tears;—tears which *precede even prayer*. So St. Ambrose describes them: but this circumstance Mr. Perceval adroitly omits in his quotation. Indeed, we strongly suspect from his mode of citing the passage, that he intended a sinister attack on confession on the score of morality, and a glance at those edifying topics of p. 383 before alluded to. If so, his procedure is so disingenuous, that it deserves the most

^{*} De Pœn. i. ch. ii. p. 391, *seq.*

[†] The context shows this word to be here synonymous with *defensio*. It can have no reference to "satisfaction" in the sense which Mr. P. attaches to the term, (p. 384.) His sneers (381) at the practice of enjoining works of devotion as penances, are unworthy of serious notice. He may, if he please, turn to Bp. Joseph Butler's celebrated Charge, where the utility of the practice is admitted.

[‡] I. 1523.

indignant reprobation. Be it as it may, the passage proves nothing against us, because it has no reference whatever to oral confession to the ministers of the Church.

Neither is the extract given from St. Chrysostom's fifth discourse against the Anomæans relevant to the subject. The preacher has instanced the case of the justified publican as an example of the efficacy of humility, and he proceeds to exhort his audience to lay open freely and humbly their hearts before God. Alluding, no doubt, to the public courts of justice, he represents the exercise as involving no disgrace before fellow-servants, no forced confession to men; let the book of conscience be unfolded before God: let the soul's wounds be exposed, let their healing be craved.* And this is to set aside the decision of the Council of Trent on the specific confession of sin! Is Mr. P. so unacquainted with our writers on prayer, as to think that this recommendation is at variance with our Church doctrine? What are the exercises of mental prayer as explained by our spiritualists,—what is our nightly examination of conscience, as proposed in all our manuals of devotion, but exemplifications of what St. Chrysostom here suggests? And sure are we, that any one, (unless he have a *formed prejudice* against auricular confession) who is habituated to this daily expansion of the heart before its Maker and self-accusation, will need no very urgent inducements to lay open his conscience to a minister of his God. "As love for Christ displays itself in charitable deeds towards those whom He has placed in his stead, (Matt. xxv. 40) so the sorrow which is according to God, finds its utterance in confession to the vicegerent of God. The internal act of virtuous *resolution* has its complement in a change of life, that of penitential love in outward confession: both manifest themselves in a manner analogous to the nature of things, and as men's sins are not of a general but determinate character, confession must, obviously, be *specific*."†

We intended to lay before our readers some passages from St. Chrysostom on sacramental confession, but we have outrun our prescribed limits, and must, therefore, be content to refer to the passage quoted in a foregoing note. Sufficient evidence has been adduced to show, that specific confession of *mortal* sin, even though secret or committed only in thought, was no invention of the Council of Trent. The *ecclesiastical* precept of *annual* confession is a determination of a *divine* law, antecedently

* Tom. i. p. 490. Ed. Montf. The next scriptural instance which he quotes is that of Azarias and his companions (Dan. iii.), where he cites what Mr. Perceval's church calls Apocrypha. It is verse 33 of our Vulgate.

† Möhler.

and independently obligatory on Christians who have forfeited the grace of God : to argue, from the recency of the former, that the latter was not recognized in preceding ages, is as illogical as to infer from the Church's appointment of festival days, or its defining the jurisdiction of bishops, that episcopal authority and religious worship are not of divine appointment. Had Innocent III, and the Council at which he presided, enacted a *mere* disciplinary regulation ;—had they insisted on confession, when the practice was considered as in every case optional ;—had the Catholic world not been fixed in the steady persuasion that the remission of mortal sin was to be obtained only by the power of the keys left to the ministers of the Church by its divine founder,—a persuasion whose existence the hazardous speculations of one or two obscure writers, contradicted by a numerous body of respectable contemporaries, will never disprove—reclamation and opposition would have been aroused. Suppose the Church of England to insist on the practice of yearly self-manifestation, by all and every one of her members : what protests, refusals, evasions, and schisms, would at once ensue ! The bishops and clergy might urge ecclesiastical authority ; but their opponents would be ready with the answer : “ Admitting the utility of unburdening of the conscience, we contend that you have no right to enforce it. The practice is optional, not of divine institution ; it has never been considered as such by us. Were it of God's appointment in any case, the regulation which you have decreed, would have our obedience ; for we allow the Church the power to fix and determine the modes and circumstances of fulfilling a divine injunction. As it is, we protest against a new law proposed as divine, whereas it is merely human ;—a law most oppressive to the conscience, and requiring a humiliation most shocking to our feelings : a yoke which neither ye nor your fathers have borne.”

We have much to say on Mr. Perceval's note respecting Extreme Unction : but we are constrained to limit ourselves to a very few observations. First, Mr. Perceval might have spared himself all his expenditure of criticism on Mark vi. 13, had he understood the expression of the decree, and considered the intention of those who framed it. He has rendered the word “*insinuatum*” by “*implied* :” he should have said figured, emblemed, or typified. The acts of the Council demonstratively show, that it never was the intention of the Fathers to infer the sacrament from the special commission given to the Apostles on the occasion recorded in St. Mark. Few of the schoolmen or ancient interpreters quoted that text as a record of the divine institution of the rite ; the Council, whatever the mendacious

Sarpi may assert, *at no time* considered it as such. Secondly, Why is the opinion of the singular and paradoxical Cardinal Cajetan* to be alleged as countervailing all other interpreters : and his cavil to set aside an exposition which is clearly deduced from the text of St. James? Were Mr. Perceval to infer the divinity of our Lord from John xx. 28, Rom. ix. 5, 1 John v. 20, a Socinian could no doubt muster up authors of the Anglican sect who have done their best or worst to impair the force of such texts. *Therefore*, such texts are never to be alleged! This is only Mr. Perceval's argument retorted upon himself. He can descant at length on the inapplicability of a passage which the Council did not allege as a warrant for the divine institution of a rite: when he comes to the passage on which the recommendation and promulgation are grounded, he skulkingly eludes it under the shelter of one single daring author, ("if Cardinal Cajetan is any authority," p. 382.) Thirdly, that "the holy rite was originally applied *chiefly* to the healing of the body," our author argues, from some expressions in the prayers, and the custom of applying the oil to the part where the pain was greatest. The word *chiefly* is dexterously inserted: our author must admit, at this rate, that some *spiritual* effect was expected. And what is the spiritual effect? we ask him; and on what warrant is it expected?—Now, as to the prayers: if Mr. P. had not been so very sparing in his quotation, his reader would have seen the following words in immediate sequel to those which he has cited:—"Ejusque sana vulnera *atque* peccata dimitte atque dolores cunctos *mentis* et corporis ab eo expelle, plenamque *interius* et *exterius* sanitatem misericorditer redde." The healing of the soul from sin and sorrow is solicited as well as the assuagement of bodily pains. That because the health of the body is prayed for, the rite of anointing was originally applied chiefly for that purpose, we can easily show to be a very absurd inference. Mr. Perceval will not maintain that the chief purpose of the Eucharist is the bodily health or nutriment. And yet he will find in post-communion prayers, transferred from old sacramentaries into the Roman Missal, many supplications to that very effect.† Equally unwarrantable is the inference from the good old usage of applying the consecrated oil to the part most affected with pain. The very sacramentary

* Does Mr. Perceval wish his readers to believe, that Cajetan wrote subsequently to the council? If not: what is the meaning of the word "*since*," &c.—p. 386.

† See the Roman Missal. 8th, 11th, 15th, and 16th Sundays after Pentecost. These same prayers will be found in St. Gregory's Sacramentary, on the 13th, 17th, 20th Sundays. The Ambrosian rite has numerous prayers to the same effect. (Ed. Pamelii, 389, 411, 423.)

which he has quoted, intimates, in the preceding line, that the unction was performed also on the neck, the throat, the breast, the back: and it refers to, and sufficiently warrants, the custom now observed universally amongst us, of anointing the five organs of sense. These various unctions, which have no necessary reference to bodily ailment, as well as the significant prayers which accompanied them, make it "manifest" that it was *not* the healing of the body that was the chief object of the rite. Fourthly, The practice of the Greek Church is neither condemned by us, nor to be held as an argument against us. The first assertion may be proved from the silence of councils: the second from the parallel case of the administration of the Eucharist to infants. That the holy sacrament of the altar was intended for adults principally, is evident; but to make infants partakers of the blessing is forbidden by no scriptural law. Infants are not excluded from the participation, but the precept is not addressed to them. So the text of St. James is an injunction to the sick, but it does not debar those who are in health from the benefit.*

We very reluctantly pass over without animadversion the misstatements of our author on the question of Purgatory† and Indulgences,† and come to the closing note, (p. 413.) The Rector has adhered faithfully to the poet's rule—"Servetur ad imum, qualis ab incepto," &c.—and we are bound to admit that the page is excellent in its way; caustic, overbearing, and braggart. We recommend it, as such, to the study of those who wish to imbue their style and temper with these three amiable qualities. The good sense of the passage is quite another affair: though perhaps that is of less consequence for the Oxford *alumni*, and others, for whose morbid appetite the Rector of East Horseley caters. We request the reader's attention to our statement.

One of the last acts of the Council of Trent, was to call on secular princes to provide for the faithful observance of its disciplinary decrees by their subjects. Whoever will even cursorily review those enactments, will see that in a great variety of matters they would affect civil usages. We need but refer to one particular,—clandestine marriages, to illustrate our meaning. Now, the Council anticipated some difficulties in the reception of these rules, and the event realized the anticipation. As it had enacted a code of canon law differing in many respects from that by which the Church had been hitherto governed, as it doomed to destruction many abuses of long

* See Saintebeuve *De Extr. Unct.* Diss. vii. Art. 1, q. 2.

† Pp. 354, 401.

‡ P. 410.

standing, and strengthened the arm of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, opposition and hindrances were naturally to be expected. And its ordinances being so multifarious and comprehensive, might require exposition for the right application of them to particular cases. Circumstances changed, and the general good of Christendom recommending, modification and alteration might be deemed expedient. Therefore, the Council expresses its confidence that the Pope will provide for the emergency, by the use of those expedients furnished by the Council itself, by calling to his aid serviceable individuals from the countries where the difficulties arise, by convoking a new general council, or adopting any other method to promote the glory of God, and the quiet of the Church.

Now, let us ask, is there any thing absurd in this provision? Or rather, is it not an evidence of the wisdom of those who formed it? The legislative power devolves the supervision of the observance of its enactments on the supreme executive. Should a new case arise, a resource to meet it is provided. Doubts on the construction of a law occur; there is a tribunal to clear them up satisfactorily. It were well if secular legislators would condescend to take an example of prudent foresight from the Fathers of Trent. The Church of England might profit by the lesson: for what authoritative interpretation of its disciplinary canons has she for the querist to refer to?

Let us ask, in the next place, where is the reason of Mr. Perceval's invective on this closing act of the Council? Does he think that the claim of the Council to divine assistance is negatived by a provision of this nature? Had the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts xv.) referred to St. Peter, or any other of their brethren, the adjudication of any new question which might arise out of their short and simple decree, such a commission would have been a denial that the Holy Ghost had presided over their deliberations! The truth is, that the whole of the Rector's invective rests on a false assumption. The Council alludes to its disciplinary regulations; he, with his usual wilfulness or blundering, makes its refer to its decisions on faith also. Now, we shall bring the dispute to a speedy issue. We have seen that difficulties were contemplated as to the reception of rules of discipline:—the fact of such difficulties having occurred, and the reason why they occurred is well known. Were any difficulties raised to the full and cordial assent of all Catholic countries to the definitions on faith? No: none. And the reason is this: the faith was not *new*: the discipline was. The faith was uniform: the customs which the discipline affected were various in every country. Again: there is a *congregation*

permanently established at Rome for the determination of questions arising out of the decrees of the Council of Trent. Its decisions are published. Will Mr. Perceval show that it has ever attempted to alter the doctrine of the Council, or even to explain its dogmatical decisions? It has done neither. It assists the Sovereign Pontiff in determining questions of discipline only, and in conformity with the laws enacted at Trent.

Thus, Mr. Perceval's assumption falls to the ground, and all the jibes and sneers which spring from such assumption are nothing more nor less than pitiable folly.

Having now completed our review of the second part of his work, we appeal to our readers whether we have not shown that it abounds in perversions of fact and testimony. And it is thus that we are convicted of schism! "*Bene habet: jacta sunt fundamenta defensionis.*" Inconsequential reasoning, self-contradiction, misapplication of several authorities, garbling and mutilating many more; suppression of what ought to be told in fairness, insinuation of that which it would be palpable falsehood to aver; misrepresentation of the questions at issue; wanton imputations, sarcastic style of invective:—such is the *farrago libelli* which the Rector of East Horseley has produced. The "*libel*" or indictment of our accuser is not substantiated. Its opening seemed very alarming: "*vultus erat multa et præclara minantis:*"—but upon comparison of evidence, and cross-examination on the principal of the allegations preferred, the result is—no case made out, except—against the prosecutor. We cannot better describe the *libel* more exactly, than in the words of the learned Harding:—"To confute any part of it, it is easy: by due examination, to stay at every untruth, it is painful. He doth not so much wring us with fastness of close arguments, as he encumbereth us with heap of loose sayings. He presseth not with weight, but troubleth with number. His blows come thick, but his weapons lack edge. Some in old time likened logic to the hand closed together, rhetoric to the hand stretched abroad. Thereof it may be conceived how much we fear this rhetorician. Well may he sweep the dust from our coats with flap of hand; he cannot hurt our bones with stroke of fist. The onset of such an enemy cannot fray us; the chasing of him may put us to some labour."

So wrote Harding of Jewell, and Mr. Perceval is the Jewell of the Church of England of the present day;—resembling his prototype in his tergiversation and method, though less provided with learning or craft to make the worse appear the better reason. Let us turn back and examine one or two of the positions he has advanced in his introductory discourse. A detailed

examination of all would carry us too far; besides, many topics which present themselves for consideration here were discussed in our last number: and we do not wish to lead our readers unnecessarily over the same ground. It appears, then, that the only way by which British and Irish Catholics can clear themselves from the imputation of schism, is "by showing that the Anglican bishops require anything which their own bishops do not require, and which was not required by the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon." (p. xxxii.) It may be as well to remind the reader, that the Catholics of these realms are considered schismatical in an especial degree.* All other Churches in communion with Rome are involved in the same species of guilt, but the term schismatical is applicable to us in a particular sense. It is certainly very gracious to unchurch the majority of Christendom by a stroke of the pen! How the Dissenters will regard the excommunicating ban we know not; but it is evident, that unless schism and Church union can go together,—unless contradictions can be reconciled,—the Church of England, with her *small* number of adherents, is (at this rate) the *sole* Church of Christ—the Catholic Church exclusively.

Now, this Church of England has articles and canons. These articles are to be subscribed by candidates for orders, and others,† in their plain and obvious sense, and assent is to be given to them simply and unequivocally.‡ To the subscribers they are a standard of doctrine from which they are engaged not to deviate. Unless, then, the clergy, and a certain portion of the laity, are to have a separate faith from the rest of the body, all members of the Anglican Church are bound to embrace, implicitly, if not explicitly, the tenets there propounded. It serves nothing to allege that "no opinion is required on these points at baptism or confirmation." The articles are a public formulary, put into every one's hands conjointly with the forms by which public worship is conducted, and their avowed purpose is to procure "the avoidance of diversities of opinion, and the establishing of *consent touching true religion*." That it rests not with a man's option to admit or reject them; that a little gentle coercion is prepared for their enforcement on the conscience, we may learn from the fifth canon,§—" *Whosoever shall hereafter affirm, that any of the nine-and-thirty articles agreed upon, &c.....are in any part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good conscience subscribe unto, let him be excommunicated*

* P. 31.

† *Laymen at the universities, for exam p le.*

‡ Tomline, ii. 573.

§ P. 22. Ed. 1713.

ipso facto, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his *repentance* and public revocation of such his *wicked error*.*

It is held then, to be sinful to affirm that any clause of the articles is erroneous, and such affirmation entails excommunication. And observe that this is not a regulation of external police, in order to quiet disputes and contentious wranglings. The affirmation is pronounced to be a *wicked error*. "Wicked error" in matters of belief must exclude from the kingdom of Christ above, and a rightful excommunication excludes from his kingdom here below.† Here, then, we find the Church of England to be as trenchant in her decision against avowed impugnors as our own Church. Will it then be said that her members may *think* as they please, provided they abstain from the obnoxious affirmation? This scheme is latitudinarian, and frustrates the purpose for which the articles were framed—"the avoidance of diversities of *opinion*."

The question is not what the Anglican bishops of the present day may require or not require:—the question is, what deference does the Church of England, *according to its constituent principles*, challenge for its definitions and decisions. Mr. Perceval might be glad to have our adhesion on any terms: but his own book bears testimony to the fact, that his fellow-religionists are not all of like mind. We occasionally hear of some half-crazed or *suspended* priest, or some ignorant and destitute layman, quitting our communion for that of the Church of England. But we invariably have the information, that he "read his recantation," or "that he renounced the errors of the Church of Rome, and embraced those of the Established Church," (to copy the whimsical phrase of one of our journalists on a well-known occasion of this nature.) Mr. Perceval's brethren also regard some of our tenets as fundamental errors. He may argue out the question with them if he please: we care not how the point be settled, but we must be allowed to express our opinion, that their authority is of equal value with his, and that they can at least claim the praise of consistency. For why, since infallibility is not asserted for the Anglican Church, should they keep separate from, and protest against, a society of believers far more numerous than their own, except in the persuasion that the errors of that society are fundamental, while the errors of

* The 141 canons were "ratified, confirmed and established" by James I.—Every minister is charged to read them in the parish church once a-year, and the church authorities are warned to see them duly observed, and not to *be sparing to execute penalties*.

† See Art. 33.

their own (supposing any to exist) are comparatively unimportant? Errableness in a Church, or even actual error, unless it corrupt vital truths, is not considered a sufficient warrant for separation. Try the consistency of their system by an example. The Catholic professes, regarding the Eucharist, "that there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, of Christ,—which change the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation." Now, how can this tenet be regarded as a non-fundamental error, if it be true (as the 28th article declares) that "Transubstantiation is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, and overthroweth the nature of a sacrament"? To maintain a doctrine clearly unscriptural and subversive of the nature of the most excellent and salutary ordinance of religion, is surely to impair grievously the *foundations* of Christ's religion. That doctrine, and all others in the same category (the articles profess to furnish a good list of such) must, unquestionless, be renounced, if the Church of England's articles be true. Avouching them to be true, pledged to maintain them as true, the clergy, who insist on a disclaimer of Transubstantiation from those who are known to have held it, act with consistency; by admitting to their communion any who are known to have held it, until they have evidence that the clearly unscriptural and deleterious error has been renounced, would be a compromise of principle. It would open the door to those who would inwardly deem what the 5th canon declares it to be a "wicked error" to affirm.

Here is a sufficient answer to the first part of Mr. Perceval's challenge. The Church of England does require what is contradictory to that which we hold as divine truth. It makes the negation of our assertions imperative on its adherents, laity as well as clergy; it must, unless it patronize deceit and falsehood in its members, make a renunciation of our doctrines in certain cases an indispensable term of communion. We opine this to be something more than our bishops require. Pass we now to the second member of the challenge.

Why has Mr. Perceval taken his stand at the Council of Chalcedon? Why not ascend to that of Nice, or higher? For what reason will he refuse to come down lower? The decisions at Ephesus and Chalcedon are, it seems, to hold good: pray, why not those of the great Lateran and Florentine synods? Let it remembered, that these last were as full congresses of universal Christendom as the former. It was the Catholic Church met in council, or the Catholic Church was no where. It will not avail to declaim against the assessors of these councils, as innovators and forcers of conscience. The 139th and 141st

canons of the Anglican Church, which claim so much for a *national* synod, and sharply rebuke and condemn the "depravers" thereof, read a good lesson against this declamation, and justify us in maintaining that these two large ecclesiastical assemblies held the same position with respect to the Universal Church, dispersed, as the two which our author has appealed to, and are entitled to the same deference. The charge of innovation and spiritual tyranny was as ready for the Nestorians' or Eutychians' use in the fifth age as for the Protestants' in the nineteenth. It is so easy to ring the changes upon the "*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*," and to abuse the admonition "*state super vias antiquas*:" easy to say, "produce* a council or ecclesiastical writer who enforced an assent to any one of these propositions, on pain of anathema, which you establish as articles of faith and terms of communion." The councils which Mr. Perceval has made the standards of orthodoxy, knew how to deal with these evasions. John of Antioch professed himself the champion of the pure unmixed Nicene doctrine:† but this profession did not satisfy the Fathers at Ephesus:—"condemn Nestorius's doctrine, which we condemn," was the answer.‡ Nay more: at Chalcedon, Theodoret's protestation against Nestorianism and Eutychianism were judged unsatisfactory, till he had distinctly anathemized Nestorius.§ Again, at the Council of Constantinople, there were framed definitions which, agreeably to Mr. Perceval's theory, might have been most reasonably demurred to. "Why, (it might have been said) why not leave the creed of Nice in its original state? That creed has pronounced nothing on the virginal conception and birth of Christ: nor on the Godhead of the Spirit. On this latter question nothing was declared at Nice.|| And since that time, even those who maintained the tenet have forborne insisting on the term.¶ Why make a difference on either of these points a ground for separation? Show that any council or ecclesiastical writer, before this discussion arose, enforced these as articles of saving belief." Let us ascend still higher, to the first general council:—"Why force our consciences by obtruding on them a profession of faith? Whence this new term consubstantial? not found in the Scriptures. How much more simple and agreeable to the comprehensive scheme of the Gospel, that short confession which was admitted by

* Perceval, 28.

† Labbe iii. 597, &c.

‡ Cyril. Alex. (ad Dynatum. Labbe iii. 1157.) It was only upon compliance with this demand that John and his associates were admitted to communion.

§ Labbe iv. 620, seq.

|| See Basil, Ep. 140. T. iii. 233, Ed. Garn.

¶ Naz. Or. xx. (on his friend St. Basil) p. 364, seq. Colonæ, 1680.

Philip the deacon as sufficient in the case of the Eunuch, (Acts viii. 37) or that which the inspired Paul (Rom. x. 9) has declared to be saving. Look, moreover, at the venerable Fathers who have preceded us with the sign of faith. Spare them at least. But you cannot proscribe *us* without an implied censure on them. Why should we be forbidden to repeat what they have uttered: why should we be constrained to profess what they were not obliged to?"

This is a counterpart to Mr. Perceval's argument against the later Church councils. We have only omitted the railing and the offensive imputations, with which it is just as easy and as fair to assail the early as the more recent synods. In *this* particular we abstain from copying him. As to the argument, (so to call it) the answer is readily furnished by St. Austin:—"Till the Arians raised a clamour, the Trinity was not perfectly treated of: till the Novatians made head, penance was not perfectly treated of. And thus, baptism was not perfectly treated of before the Rebaptisers from without (*foris positi*) contradicted: nor were the clear decisions on the Christian unity propounded till after the (Donatist) schism."* But the decisions of the Church, whether congregated in a synod or *dispersed*, were regarded as peremptory and infallible; those who reject them were stigmatized as heretics or schismatics. In like manner, *other* Catholic truths were propounded and insisted upon; the existence of original sin, the necessity of baptism and of preventing grace, the two-fold will of Christ. No dissent was tolerated:—the Catholic faith, ascertained by the Church's *authoritative* testimony, challenged the sincere admission of all.

On what ground will Mr. Perceval justify the Church of England's assertion of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, or its anathematizing, in the Anathasian creed, those who do not "faithfully and firmly" believe that tenet? How will he justify the retaining of the "interpolation" *filioque* in the Constantinopolitan creed; or the maintaining of the other creed in the Anglican Liturgy? For both he must descend some years (for the "interpolation," indeed, a century or more) from the Council of Chalcedon. Now, let him lay his hand on a text of Scripture, on a council or ecclesiastical writer of the five first centuries, declaring that those who do not "firmly and faithfully" assent to that tenet, and to *all* contained in the Athanasian creed, will no doubt perish everlastingly. "If he can do this—well; if not, and if the foregoing parallel between the exercise of authority by the Catholic Church in the early ages

* In Psalm liv. n. 2. vol. iv. p. 388.

and that in subsequent times, cannot be satisfactorily contradicted, the second part of his challenge is answered."

The Church of England, as we have seen, decrees the penalty of excommunication against any one guilty of the "wicked error" of affirming any of her articles to be erroneous. Her *non-exercise* of the authority thus asserted does not affect the question at issue here. She *asserts* it. Now, it would avail nothing for the excommunicated party to pretend that he had not separated from her communion: that she exacts unwarrantable terms of communion, and so forth. The ejected ministers at the Restoration were not allowed the benefit of a plea like this; and what is pronounced of an individual is (in the present case) applicable to any number or class. Commit the "wicked error" of affirming that any clause of the Thirty-nine Articles is erroneous, and excommunication ensues. The sentence need not be awaited: you are already out of the Church's pale, and can re-enter only after *repentance*. Now, in the sixteenth century, the new modellers of doctrine, varying and conflicting with themselves, were in contradiction with the defined and received tenets of that Church in which they had been baptized, whose authority they had professed to obey, in whose worship they had long participated. Their opposition was sufficient to cut them off from that Church: no sentence of excommunication was required: they were subverted, being condemned by their own judgment." For, "a man may not only passively and involuntarily be rejected, but also may, by an act of his own, cast out or reject himself, not only by plain and complete apostacy, but by a defection from the unity of truth, falling into some damnable heresy; or by an active separation, deserting all who are in communion with the Catholic Church, and falling into an irrecoverable schism."*

One word, in conclusion, on Mr. Perceval's "Canonical Bishops," whose rights he pretends that our prelates invade. We say nothing on the validity of the Anglican bishops' ordination; not because we admit it, but because their being effectively consecrated, does not imply their jurisdiction. A suspended or excommunicated prelate can have no jurisdiction, even according to Anglican canon law, we presume: and excommunication is a penalty which *she* awards to "wicked error" on her articles and to other offences. The episcopal character may subsist without the episcopal office and right. We smile while we read "that the bishops in England, Scotland, and Ireland, were deprived for their adherence to the uncanonical and usurped foreign

* Pearson on the 9th Article.

jurisdiction of the bishop of Rome, which he exercised here in violation of the decrees of the Councils of Nice and Ephesus.* We marvel that their predecessors, many of them sharp-sighted men too, did not, in the course of so many centuries, make the discovery in canon law which Elizabeth and her godly helpers were so happy as to light upon. Well, this is the ground on which Mr. Perceval justifies their deprivation. Is this the ground on which their deprivation was *resolved upon*? And, what if the decrees of Nice and Ephesus were in no way opposed to that jurisdiction which these prelates recognized? Mr. Perceval must *prove* that there was this opposition; he must prove the papal jurisdiction to have been an usurpation; he must prove that the adhesion (or rather, submission) to this usurpation, was the reason alleged for superseding these bishops. He must prove all these things. He has not yet done so. The mere fact of deprivation of the old, will not establish the rightful authority of the new. "Deprived?" Why: so was Paul of Constantinople; so was Athanasius of Alexandria. "Deprived?" By what power;—after what process? A summary decision of the *secular* government! Will he favour us with some canons of Ephesus, or Nice, or Chalcedon, which warrant this procedure? A council, a hearing, a canonical sentence, justified by Church-law and precedent: these were required on the occasion. Instead of which—"Dux femina facti." Surely, if "appointments to *vacant* sees are to be made at the advice of the metropolitan and bishops of the province;"—if this be "according to the rules of the Catholic Church;† the rules of the Catholic Church were, indeed, flagitiously violated in the summary and wholesale expulsion of prelates from their sees—metropolitan‡ and suffragans alike—by the arm of secular power. To borrow Mr. P.'s words, "it cannot be shown that the Church consented to these things,"—the case is, therefore, strengthened against the infringers of the canons. The bishops were, then, illegally deprived. There was consequently no vacancy in their sees, and Mr. Perceval may now read his Antiochene and Chalcedonian canons, to pronounce sentence on those who took the benefit of the extrusion of the rightful possessors, those creatures of a court who "went into cities and districts not pertaining to them, and ordained or appointed presbyters or deacons to places subject to other bishops without their consent;"§—so much for their ingress into the fold: "not entering in at the door, but climbing up some other way. To them the porter opened *not*."

* P. 31.

† P. 66.

‡ Heath, Archbishop of York.

§ P. 31, 39.

Much more might be added: but we hasten to a close. We dismiss without a word of comment the assertion that the bishops of *Scotland* were deprived, in the sixteenth century, for their adherence to an uncanonical and foreign jurisdiction: but we must ask where did he learn that the bishops of *Ireland* "can trace no descent, nor pretend to be descended from the ancient churches" [bishops] therein. We know well that the prelates of our national and orthodox Church were expelled and sent adrift: but we know also that they continued their apostolic functions, and that the chain of our hierarchy remains unbroken. The succession is clearly traceable. If Dr. Crolly style himself Archbishop of Armagh, (or, *in* Armagh, as the act of Emancipation will not tolerate the other designation) it is because he claims descent from, St. Patrick: Dr. Murray regards himself as the successor of St. Lawrence, whose virtues and titles he has equally inherited. To any one who, like Dr. Philpotts, might charge them with usurping the titles belonging to the bishops of the Establishment, they might return the answer of the eloquent Archbishop M'Hale:—"Usurp *your* titles! It is not yours that we *usurp*, it is *OUR OWN* that we *perpetuate*."

Before Mr. Perceval ventures again to tilt at bishops "who derive their orders from Italy,"* let him reperuse page 143 of his former work.—"It is certain and undeniable that the whole Saxon heptarchy was heathen, when the Bishop of Rome sent over St. Augustine to instruct us in the *true faith*. Our relation to her," (the Church of Rome) "is, therefore, one degree higher than it has been hitherto stated; she is not only our sister Church, but may in some sense be styled *our mother*: and though this cannot and should not prevent our seeing her errors and avoiding them, it should at least entitle her to *kindness, affection, and respect*, at our hands, whatever her conduct to us may have been." Mr. Perceval's *respect* for the vicars of this "*mother Church*," this Church "to which, under God, Englishmen owe their Christian life,"† Mr. Perceval's *respect*, we say, is shown by describing them as inexcusable schismatics. As to his *kindness and affection*, the reader must be hard, indeed, to satisfy, if he is not convinced by the tokens these pages have furnished. Verily the Rector of Horseley has given us a felicitous illustration of "a new way to pay old debts."

We have done. When Mr. P. next comes before the public, he will, it is to be hoped, be more cautious as to his positions; more temperate in his language; more candid, honest, and

* P. 23.

† Ubi supra.

even-handed in the use of his authorities; more just and equitable towards those whom he takes upon himself to impugn. He may be assured that professions of charity and zeal for the truth—contradicted by the whole strain and tenour of a book—pass for nothing with intelligent readers; that such “persons (we use his own words*) “may be forgiven if they think that there is *something else* besides the difference in religion which excites this fierce and deadly hatred;” and finally, that insult and misrepresentation, come from what quarter they will, have to expect a just repulse and ignominious exposure.

ART. X.—1. *Animal and Vegetable Physiology, considered with reference to Natural Theology.* By Dr. Roget.

2. *Letters on Natural Magic.* By Sir David Brewster.

THE erroneous testimony which our senses frequently render, is demonstrated by numberless proofs, deducible from every-day experience, as well as from the various researches of the learned in philosophy and the natural sciences. This assertion will be sufficiently illustrated by the following references to some of the many recent works, which might, if necessary, be noticed in attestation of it.

THE IMAGINARY ISLAND OF ST. BRANDAN.†—One of the most singular geographical illusions on record, is that which for a long time haunted the imagination of the inhabitants of the Canaries. They fancied they saw a mountainous island, of about ninety leagues in length, lying far to the westward. It was seen only at intervals, though in perfectly clear and serene weather. To some it seemed one hundred leagues distant, to others forty, to others only fifteen or eighteen.‡

On attempting to reach it, however, it somehow or other eluded the search, and was nowhere to be found. Still there were so many persons of credibility who concurred in testifying to their having seen it, and the testimony of the inhabitants of different islands agreed so well as to its form and position, that its existence was generally believed; and geographers inserted it in their maps. It is laid down on the globe of Martin Behem, projected in 1492, as delineated by M. de Murr, and it will be

* Peace Offering, 123.

† See Life of Columbus, by Washington Irving, vol. iv. pp. 317, &c.

‡ Teyjoo, Theatro Critico, tom. iv. d. 10, sect. 29.

found in most of the maps of the time of Columbus, placed commonly about two hundred leagues west of the Canaries. During the time that Columbus was making his proposition to the court of Portugal, an inhabitant of the Canaries applied to King John II for a vessel to go in search of this island.*

Some have maintained that this island was known to the ancients, and was the same mentioned by Ptolemy, among the Fortunate, or Canary Islands, by the name of Aprositus,† a Greek word, signifying inaccessible; and which, according to Friar Diego Philipo, in his book on the incarnation of Christ, shows that it possessed the same quality in ancient times, of deluding the eye, and being unattainable to the feet of mortals.‡ But whatever belief the ancients may have had on the subject, it is certain that it took a strong hold on the faith of the moderns during the prevalent rage for discovery; nor did it lack abundant testimonials. Don Joseph de Viera y Clavijo says, there never was a more difficult paradox or problem in the science of geography; since to affirm the existence of this island is to trample upon sound criticism, judgment, and reason; and to deny it, one must abandon tradition and experience, and suppose that many persons of credit had not the proper use of their senses.§

The belief in this island has continued long since the time of Columbus. It was repeatedly seen, and by various persons at a time, always in the same place, and in the same form. In 1526, an expedition set off for the Canaries in quest of it, commanded by Fernando de Troya and Fernando Alvarez. They cruised in the wonted direction, but in vain; and their failure ought to have undeceived the public. "The phantasm of the island, however," says Viera, "had such a secret enchantment for all who beheld it, that the public preferred doubting the good conduct of the explorers rather than their own senses." In 1570, the appearances were so repeated and clear, that there was a universal fever of curiosity awakened among the people of the Canaries, and it was determined to send forth another expedition. That they might not appear to act on light grounds an exact investigation was previously made, of all the persons of talent and credibility who had seen these apparitions of land, or who had other proofs of its existence.

* The name of St. Brandan, or Borondon, given to this imaginary island from time immemorial, is said to be derived from a Scotch abbot, who flourished in the sixth century, and who is called sometimes by the foregoing appellations, sometimes St. Blandano or St. Blandanus.

† Ptolemy, l. iv. t. iv.

‡ Fr. D. Philipo, lib. viii. fol. 25.

§ Hist. Isl. Can. l. i. c. xxviii.

Alonzo de Espinosa, governor of the Island of Ferro, accordingly made a report, in which more than one hundred witnesses, several of them persons of the highest respectability, deposed that they had beheld the unknown island about forty leagues to the north-west of Ferro; that they had contemplated it with calmness and certainty, and had seen the sun set behind one of its points.

The mass of testimony collected by official authority in 1570 seemed so satisfactory, that another expedition was fitted out in the same year, in the Island of Palma. It was commanded by Fernando de Villalobos, regidor of the island; but was equally fruitless with the preceding. St. Borondon seemed disposed only to tantalize the world with distant and serene glimpses of his ideal paradise, or to reveal it amidst storms to tempest-tost mariners; but to hide it completely from the view of all who diligently sought it. Still the people of Palma adhered to their favourite chimera. Thirty-four years afterwards, in 1605, they sent another ship on the quest, commanded by Gaspar Perez de Acosta, an accomplished pilot, accompanied by the Padre Lorenzo Pinedo, a holy Franciscan friar, skilled in natural science. San Borondon, however, refused to reveal his island to either monk or mariner. After cruising about in every direction, sounding, observing the skies, the clouds, the winds, every thing that could furnish indications, they returned without having seen anything to authorize a hope.

Upwards of a century now elapsed without any new attempt to seek this fairy island. Every now and then, it is true, the public mind was agitated by fresh reports of its having been seen. Lemons, and other fruits, and the green branches of trees, which floated to the shores of Gomara and Ferro, were pronounced to be from the enchanted groves of San Borondon. At length, in 1721, the public infatuation again rose to such a height, that a fourth expedition was sent, commanded by Don Gaspar Dominguez, a man of probity and talent. As this was an expedition of solemn and mysterious import, he had two holy friars as apostolical chaplains. They made sail from the Island of Teneriffe towards the end of October, leaving the populace in an indescribable state of anxious curiosity. The ship, however, returned from its cruise as unsuccessful as all its predecessors.

We have no account of any expedition being since undertaken, though the island still continued to be a subject of speculation, and occasionally to reveal its shadowy mountains to the eyes of favoured individuals. In a letter, written from the Island of Gomera in 1759, by a Franciscan monk to one of his friends, he relates having seen it from the village of Alaxero, at six in

the morning of the 3rd of May. It appeared to consist of two lofty mountains, with a deep valley between, and, on contemplating it with a telescope, the valley or ravine appeared to be filled with trees. He summoned the curate, Antonio Joseph Manrique, and upwards of forty other persons, all of whom beheld it plainly.*

Nor is this island delineated merely in ancient maps of the time of Columbus. It is laid down as one of the Canary Islands in a French map published in 1704; and Mons. Gautier, in a geographical chart annexed to his "Observations on Natural History," published in 1755, places it five degrees to the west of the Island of Ferro, in the 29th degree of north latitude.†

Such are the principal facts existing relative to the island of St. Brandan. Its reality was for a long time a matter of firm belief. It was in vain that repeated voyages and investigations proved its non-existence: the public, after trying all kinds of sophistry, took refuge in the supernatural, to defend their favourite chimera. They maintained that it was rendered inaccessible to mortals by Divine Providence, or by diabolical magic. Most inclined to the former. All kinds of extravagant fancies were indulged concerning it.‡ Some confounded it with the fabled island of the Seven Cities, situated somewhere in the bosom of the ocean, where, in old times, seven bishops and their followers had taken refuge from the Moors. Some of the Portuguese imagined it to be the abode of their lost king, Sebastian. The Spaniards pretended that Roderick, the last of their Gothic kings, had fled thither from the Moors, after the disastrous battle of the Gaudalete. Others suggested that it might be the seat of the terrestrial paradise; the place where Enoch and Elijah remained in a state of blessedness until the final day; and that it was made at times apparent to the eyes, but invisible to the search of mortals. Poetry, it is said, has owed to this popular belief one of its beautiful fictions; and the Garden of Armida, where Rinaldo was detained enchanted, and which Tasso places in one of the Canary Islands, has been identified with the imaginary San Borondon.§

The learned father Feyjoo|| has given a philosophical solution to this geographical problem. He attributes all these appearances, which have been so numerous and so well authenticated as not to admit of doubt, to certain atmospherical deceptions, like that of the *fata morgana*, seen at times in the Straits of Messina, where the city of Reggio and its surrounding country

* Viera, Hist. Isl. Can. t. i. c. 28. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. ubi sup. § Ibid.

|| Theatro Critico, t. iv. d. 10.

is reflected in the air above the neighbouring sea; a phenomenon which has likewise been witnessed in front of the city of Marseilles.

As the populace, however, reluctantly give up anything that partakes of the marvellous and mysterious, and as the same atmospheric phenomena which first gave birth to the illusion may still continue, it is not improbable that a belief in the Island of St. Brandan may still exist among the ignorant and credulous of the Canaries, and that they at times behold its fairy mountains rising above the distant horizon of the Atlantic.

THE MIRAGE.—In describing his journey across the desert to Rosetta, Dr. Clarke observes :—

"The Arabs, uttering their harsh guttural language, ran chattering by the sides of our asses; until some of them calling out 'Raschdid!' we perceived its domes and turrets, apparently upon the opposite side of an immense lake or sea, that covered all the intervening space between us and the city. Not having at the time any doubt as to the certainty of its being water, and seeing the tall minarets and buildings of Rosetta, with all its groves of dates and sycamores, as perfectly reflected by it as by a mirror, insomuch that even the minutest detail of the architecture and of the trees might have been thence delineated, we applied to the Arabs to be informed in what manner we were to pass the water. Our interpreter, although a Greek, and therefore likely to have been informed of such a phenomenon, was as fully convinced as any of us that we were drawing near the water's edge, and became indignant when the Arabs maintained that, within an hour, we should reach Rosetta, by crossing the sands in the direct line we then pursued, and that there was no water. 'What!' said he, giving way to his impatience, 'do you suppose me an idiot, to be persuaded contrary to the evidence of my senses?' The Arabs, smiling, soon pacified him, and completely astonished the whole party, by desiring us to look back at the desert we had already passed, where we beheld a similar appearance. It was, in fact, the Mirage;* a prodigy to which

* An explanation of the phenomenon called *Mirage* by the French, was published at Cairo, in the *Décade Egyptienne*, vol. i. p. 39, by Monge: it is too long for insertion here: but the author thus previously describes the illusion :—

"Le soir et le matin, l'aspect du terrain est tel qu'il doit être; et entre vous et les derniers villages qui s'offrent à votre vue, vous n'apercevez que la terre; mais dès que la surface du sol est suffisamment échauffée par la présence du soleil, et jusqu'à ce que vers le soir elle commence à se refroidir, le terrain ne paraît plus avoir la même extension, et il paraît terminé à une lieue environ par un inondation générale. Les villages qui sont placés au-delà de cette distance paraissent comme des îles situées au milieu d'un grand lac, et dont on serait séparé par un étendue d'eau plus ou moins considérable. Sous chacun des villages on voit son image renversée, telle qu'on la verrait effectivement s'il y avait en avant une surface d'eau réfléchissante."

To this Monge adds, that the large masses only are distinctly reflected; but when the *Mirage* is very perfect, the most minute detail, whether of trees or buildings, may be plainly perceived, trembling as when the inverted images of objects appear in water, the surface whereof is agitated by wind.

every one of us were then strangers, although it afterwards became more familiar. Yet upon no subsequent occasion did we ever behold this extraordinary illusion so marvellously displayed. The view of it afforded us ideas of the horrible despondency to which travellers must sometimes be exposed, who, in traversing the interminable desert, destitute of water, and perishing with thirst, have sometimes this deceitful prospect before their eyes."—*Clarke's Travels*, vol. iii. p. 369.

The author of a most useful and deservedly popular work has sketched with a graphic pen the same optical delusion.*

The phenomenon of the *Mirage* excites in the pilgrim of the deserts those alternations of hope and disappointment, which add to the miseries of his actual situation. He sees before him lakes of water, which are gone the instant he arrives at the spot where he fancied they offered their refreshment to his feverish lips. The Arabs are familiar with this remarkable appearance, and they are seldom deceived by it; although, if the *Mirage* and a real stream could be seen at the same time, it would be difficult to distinguish the reality from the delusion.† The guides of the European traveller often amuse themselves by calling to him that water is in sight, when they are upon the most thirsty spots of a sandy or gravelly plain. Burckhardt has described the *Mirage* with his usual felicity:—

"During the whole day's march we were surrounded on all sides by lakes of mirage, called by the Arabs, Serab. Its colour was of the purest azure, and so clear that the shadows of the mountains which bordered the horizon were reflected in it with the greatest precision, and the delusion of its being a sheet of water was thus rendered still more perfect. I had often seen the *Mirage* in Syria and Egypt, but always found it of a whitish colour, rather resembling a morning mist, seldom lying steady on the plain, but in continual vibration; but here it was very different, and had the most perfect resemblance to water. The appearance of water approached also much nearer than in Syria and Egypt, being often not more than two hundred paces from us, whereas I had never seen it before at a distance of less than half a mile. There were at one time about a dozen of these false lakes around us, each separated from the other, and for the most part in the low grounds."‡

The *Mirage* is caused by the extraordinary refraction which the rays of the sun undergo, in passing through masses of air in contact with a surface greatly heated. These atmospheric delusions are not confined to the appearance of water in the desert. The traveller, fainting beneath a burning sun, sees a tree in the distance, sufficiently large for him to find a shade beneath its

* "The Library of Entertaining Knowledge."—The Menageries, vol. i. pp. 296, &c.

† Lyon, p. 347.

‡ Nubia, p. 193.

boughs. He quickens his pace, hoping to enjoy half an hour of refreshing coolness, before his camels shall have passed. The tree is really a miserable shrub, that does not afford shade enough to shelter one of his hands. This magnifying of objects is produced by the slight vapour which rises when the heat is greatest. When the sun gleams on the sand-hills, they appear at an immense distance; the traveller hopes that his camels may be spared the pain of crossing these slippery ascents,—when in a few minutes he is close upon them, and sees a man or a camel, within a stone's throw, toiling to the top.* As the sun ascends towards the zenith, and the earth and the currents of air assume different temperatures, the phenomenon of the Mirage presents numerous modifications. Humboldt states, that in the plains of South America, where the air is very dry, he often saw the images of troops of wild oxen, suspended in the air, long before the eye could see the oxen themselves; and the small currents of air were of such a variable temperature, that the legs of some appeared to rest on the ground, while others were elevated above it. In Arabia, Niebuhr observed the image of an animal reversed, before he saw the direct image. Sometimes towers, and large masses of apparent buildings, are seen upon the horizon, which disappear at intervals, without the traveller being able to decide upon the true forms of the objects, which are probably little sand-hills, beyond the ordinary range of vision.† All these phenomena are modifications of the Mirage, though the name is generally applied to the unreal lakes of the desert. The Persian and Arabian poets make frequent allusions to these magical effects of terrestrial refraction.

The same phenomenon of the Mirage is observed in Persia, where it is denominated the *Seraub*. The following extract from a little work, entitled "*Uncle Oliver's Travels—Persia*," refers to this optical illusion:—

"We must not leave the deserts without considering that very remarkable appearance which is so frequently observed in them, and which in the east is called the *Seraub*, a word which means 'the water of the desert.' It is, however, not really water, but the appearance of water. As it is seen most generally in the hot deserts, where there is really no water, and where water would be the greatest of blessings, there can hardly be a more distressing illusion than this. Only suppose a man riding in the desert, where he has not seen any water for a long time, and is, perhaps, in such an agony of thirst, that he would willingly give his right arm for a cup of cold water. Think how delighted he must be to see a fine lake of water spread out before him. Oh, with what joy and desire he hastens to quench his raging

* See Lyon, p. 347.† Humboldt's *Voyages*, liv. vi. chap. 17.

thirst, and cool his parched skin! But, as he comes to it, it goes from him. He cannot overtake it; and, at last it vanishes away, and sometimes appears again at a distance beyond; or, if he looks behind him, he may see that he has passed through what always seemed before him until he had passed it. It was but a vapour lying on the ground; and when the poor traveller finds this out, he becomes a thousand times more thirsty than before, from mere disappointment."

Discussing the principles on which physical science relies for its successful prosecution, Sir J. Herschel, in his admirable "Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy," passes the following remarks:—

"It is necessary to distinguish between two kinds of prejudices, which exercise very different dominion over the mind. They are prejudices of opinion and prejudices of sense.—(p. 80.) Our resistance against the destruction of the other class of prejudices, those of sense, is commonly more violent at first, but less persistent, than in the case of those of opinion. Not to trust the evidence of our senses, seems, indeed, a hard condition, and one which, if proposed, none would comply with. But it is not the direct evidence of our senses that we are in any case called upon to reject, but only the erroneous judgments we unconsciously form from them, and this only when they can be shown to be so *by counter evidence of some sort*; when one sense is brought to testify against another, for instance; or the same sense against itself, and the obvious conclusions in the two cases disagree, so as to compel us to acknowledge that one or other must be wrong. For example, nothing at first can seem a more rational, obvious, and uncontrovertible conclusion, than that the *colour* of an object is an inherent quality, like its weight, hardness, &c., and that to *see* the object, and see it of *its own colour*, when nothing intervenes between our eyes and it, are one and the same thing. But this is only a prejudice; and that it is so, is shown by bringing forward the same sense of vision which led to its adoption, as evidence on the other side; for when the differently coloured prismatic rays are thrown, in a dark room, in succession upon any object, whatever be the colour we are in the habit of calling its own, it will appear of the particular hue of the light which falls upon it; a yellow paper, for instance, will appear scarlet when illuminated by red rays, yellow when by yellow, green by green, and blue by blue rays; its own (so called) proper colour *not in the least degree mixing with that it so exhibits.*"

"To give one or two more examples of the kind of illusion which the senses practise on us, or rather which we practise on ourselves, by misinterpretation of their evidence; the moon, at its rising and setting, appears much larger than when high up in the sky. This is, however, a mere erroneous judgment; for when we come to measure its diameter, so far from finding our conclusion borne out by fact, we actually find it to measure materially less. Here is eyesight opposed to eyesight, with the advantage of deliberate measurement. In ventriloquism we have the hearing at variance with the other senses, and

especially with the sight, which is sometimes contradicted by it in a very extraordinary and surprising manner, as when the voice is made to seem to issue from an inanimate and motionless object. If we plunge our hands, one into ice-cold water, and the other into water as hot as can be borne, and after letting them stay awhile, suddenly transfer them both to a vessel full of water at a blood-heat, the one will feel a sensation of heat, the other of cold. And if we cross the two first fingers of one hand, and place a pea in the fork between them, moving and rolling it about on a table, we shall (especially if we close our eyes) be fully persuaded we have two peas. If the nose be held while we are eating cinnamon, we shall perceive no difference between its flavour and that of a deal shaving."—*Preliminary Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy*, by Sir J. Herschel, p. 83.

Dr. Chandler, on noting down his entry into the Mediterranean, gives the following description of the setting of the sun:—

"The sun, before its setting, was exceedingly big, and assumed a variety of fantastic shapes. It was surrounded at first with a golden glory, of great extent, and glanced above the surface of the sea in a long column of fire. The lower half of the orb soon after immersed in the horizon, the other portion remaining very large and red, with half of a smaller orb beneath it, and separate, but in the same direction, the circular line approaching the line of its diameter. These two, by degrees, united, and then changed rapidly into different figures, until the resemblance was that of a capacious punch-bowl inverted. The rim of the bottom extending upward, and the body lengthening below, it became a mushroom on a stalk with a round head. It was next metamorphosed into a flaming cauldron, of which the lid, rising up, swelled nearly into an orb, and vanished. The other portions put on several uncircular forms, and after many twinklings and faint glimmerings, slowly disappeared, quite red."*

REMARKABLE OPTICAL ILLUSION.—"An ocular delusion occurred to myself," says Sir David Brewster, "of so extraordinary a nature, that I am convinced it never was seen before, and I think it far from probable that it will be ever seen again. Upon directing my eyes to the candles that were standing before me, I was surprised to observe, apparently among my hair and nearly straight above my head, and far without the range of vision, a distinct image of one of the candles, inclined about 45° to the horizon. The image was as distinct and perfect as if it had been formed by reflection from a piece of mirror glass, though of course much less brilliant, and the position of the image proved that it must be formed by reflection from a perfectly flat and highly polished surface. But where such a surface could be placed, and how, even if it were fixed,

* "Chandler's Travels in Asia Minor," p. 3. In talking of the Bridge of Ronda, Jacob, in his "Travels in the South of Spain," p. 234, observes, "When standing on the bridge, the optical delusion is very singular; the torrent of water appears to run up a hill towards the bridge, and the same phenomenon takes place when viewed in either direction."

it could reflect the image of the candle up through my head, were difficulties not a little perplexing. Thinking that it might be something lodged in the eyebrow, I covered it up from the light, but the image still retained its place. I then examined the eyelashes with as little success, and was driven to the extreme supposition that a chrystallization was taking place in some part of the aqueous humour of the eye, and that the image was formed by the reflection of the light of the candle from one of the chrystalline faces. In this state of uncertainty, and, I may add, of anxiety, for this last supposition was by no means an agreeable one, I set myself down to examine the phenomenon experimentally. I found that the image varied its place by the motion of the head and of the eyeball, or occupied a place where it was affected by that motion. Upon inclining the candle at different angles, the image suffered corresponding variations of position. In order to determine the exact place of the reflecting substance, I now took an opaque circular body, and held it between the eye and the candle, till it eclipsed the mysterious image. By bringing the body nearer and nearer the eyeball till its shadow being sufficiently distinct to be seen, it was easy to determine the locality of the reflector, because the shadow of the opaque body must fall upon it whenever the image of the candle was eclipsed. In this way I ascertained that the reflecting body was in the upper eyelash, and I found, that in consequence of being disturbed, it had twice changed its inclination, so as to represent a vertical candle in a horizontal position, and afterwards in an inverted position. Still, however, I sought for it in vain, and even with the aid of a magnifier, I could not discover it. At last, however, Mrs. B., who possesses the perfect vision of short-sighted persons, discovered, after repeated examinations between two eyelashes, a minute speck, which, upon being removed with great difficulty, turned out to be a chip of red wax not above the hundredth part of an inch in diameter, and having its surface so perfectly flat and so highly polished, that I could see in it the same image of the candle, by placing it extremely near the eye. This chip of wax had no doubt received its flatness and its polish from the surface of a seal, and had started into my eye when breaking the seal of a letter.*

Can anything be more deceptive to the eyes than the imposition practised on that organ by a mass of ice-land or double refracting spar, and by several other refracting substances? Of these, many have tortured the philosopher's ingenuity for a plausible solution. If a slip of paper, on which a sentence, or a line, or any figure, is traced, be held behind the spar of a cubic form, the paper will exhibit the same sentence or figure twice, as if it were twice written or figured with it. A pyramidal crystal of transparent quartz, may be held in such a position, that if the head of the pin be placed against the underside of the prism, it will be visible on three planes of the prism, and on

* "Natural Magic," p. 32.

three of the pyramid, at the same time. The two images of a circle, described with a pen upon paper, may be made nearly to coincide, by holding a rhomb of calcareous spar in a particular direction, and they may be made almost to separate by another position. The cause of the phenomenon of double refraction is not understood, farther than that it is in consequence of peculiar transmission of the rays of light, owing, as it is conjectured, to the construction of the mineral.*

Many membranous shells exhibit, on several parts of their internal surface, a glistening, silvery, or iridescent appearance. This appearance is caused by the peculiar thinness, transparency, and regularity of arrangement of the outer layers of the membrane, which, in conjunction with the particles of carbonate of lime, enter into the formation of that part of the surface of the shell. The surface which has thus acquired a pearly lustre, was formerly believed to be a peculiar substance, which was dignified with the appellation of *mother of pearl*, from the notion that was entertained of its being the material of which pearls were formed. It is true, indeed, that pearls are actually composed of the same materials, and have the same laminated structure, as the membranous shells; being formed by very thin concentric plates of membrane and carbonate of lime, disposed alternately, and often surrounding a central body: but Sir David Brewster has satisfactorily shown, that the iridescent colours exhibited by these surfaces, are wholly the effect of the parallel grooves consequent upon the regularity of arrangement of shells.†

MOTIONS OF THE EYES IN PORTRAITS.—A series of curious, and sometimes alarming, deceptions, arises from the representations of objects in perspective, upon a plane surface. One of the most interesting of these depends on the principles which regulate the apparent direction of the eyes in a portrait. When we look at any person, we direct to them both our face and our eyes, and in this position the circular iris will be in the middle of the white of the eyeball, or, what is the same thing, there will be the same quantity of white on each side of the iris. If the eyes are now moved to either side, while the head remains fixed, we shall readily judge of the change of their direction by the greater or less quantity of white on each side of the iris. This test, however, accurate as it is, enables us only to estimate the extent to which the eyes deviate in direction from the direction of the face to which they belong. But their direction, in reference to the person who views them, is entirely a different matter; and Dr. Wollaston is of opinion, that we are not guided

* Phillip's "Mineralogy," p. xxxvi.

† "Animal and Vegetable Physiology," by Roget, vol. i. p. 231.

by the eyes alone, but are unconsciously aided by the concurrent position of the entire face.

If a skilful painter draws a pair of eyes with great correctness directed to the spectator, and deviating from the general position of the face, as much as is usual in good portraits, it is very difficult to determine their direction, and they will appear to have different directions to different persons. But what is very curious, Dr. Wollaston has shown that the same pair of eyes may be made to direct themselves either to or from the spectator, by the addition of other features in which the position of the face is changed.

It is a well-known fact, that when the eyes of a portrait look at a spectator in front of it, they will follow him, and appear to look at him in every other direction. This curious fact, which has received less consideration than it merits, has been often skilfully employed by the novelist, in alarming the fears or exciting the courage of his hero. On returning to the hall of his ancestors, his attention is powerfully fixed on the grim portraits which surround him. The parts which they have respectively performed in the family history rise to his mind: his own actions, whether good or evil, are called up in contrast, and as the preserver or the destroyer of his line, he stands, as it were, in judgment before them. His imagination, thus excited by conflicting feelings, transfers a sort of vitality to the canvas, and if the personages do not "start from their frames," they will at least bend upon him their frowns or their approbation. It is in vain that he tries to evade their scrutiny. Wherever he goes, their eyes eagerly pursue him;—they will seem even to look at him over their shoulders, and he will find it impossible to shun their gaze but by quitting the apartment.†

AERIAL SPECTRES IN CUMBERLAND.—One of the most interesting accounts of aerial spectres with which we are acquainted, has been given by Mr. James Clarke, in his survey of the lakes of Cumberland, and the accuracy of this account was confirmed by the attestations of two of the persons, by whom the phenomena were first seen. On a summer's evening, in the year 1743, when Daniel Stricket, servant to John Wren of Wilton Hall, was sitting at the door along with his master, he saw the figure of a man with a dog pursuing some horses along Souterfell side, a place so extremely steep that a horse could scarcely travel upon it at all. The figures appeared to run at an amazing pace, till they got out of sight at the lower end of the fell. On the following morning, Stricket and his master ascended the

† "Natural Magic," p. 118.

steep side of the mountain, in the full expectation of finding the man dead, and of picking up some of the shoes of the horses, which they thought must have been cast while galloping at such a furious rate. Their expectations, however, were disappointed, no traces either of man or horse could be found, and they could not even discover upon the turf the single mark of a horse's hoof. These strange appearances, seen at the same time by two different persons in perfect health, could not fail to make a deep impression on their minds. They at first concealed what they had seen, but they at length disclosed it, and were laughed at for their credulity.

In the following year, on the 23rd of June, 1744, Daniel Stricket, who was then servant to Mr. Lancaster of Blakehills, (a place near Wilton Hall, and both of which places are only about half a mile from Souterfell) was walking, about seven o'clock in the evening, a little above the house, when he saw a troop of horsemen riding on Souterfell side, in pretty close ranks, and at a brisk pace. Recollecting the ridicule that had been cast upon him the preceding year, he continued to observe the figures for some time in silence; but being at last convinced that there could be no deception in the matter, he went to the house and informed his master that he had something curious to show him. They accordingly went out together; but before Stricket had pointed out the place, Mr. Lancaster's son had discovered the aerial figures. The family was then summoned to the spot, and the phenomena were seen alike by them all. The equestrian figures seemed to come from the lowest parts of Souterfell, and became visible at a place called Knott. They then advanced in regular troops along the side of the fell, till they came opposite to Blakehills, when they went over the mountain, after describing a kind of curvilinear path. The pace at which the figures moved, was a regular swift walk, and they continued to be seen for upwards of two hours, the approach of darkness alone preventing them from being visible. Many troops were seen in succession; and frequently the last but one in a troop quitted his position, galloped to the front, and took up the same pace as the rest. The changes in the figures were seen equally by all the spectators, and the view of them was not confined to the farm of Blakehills only, but they were to be seen by every person at every cottage within the distance of a mile, the number of persons who saw them amounting to about twenty-six. The attestation of these facts, signed by Lancaster and Stricket, bears the date of the 21st July, 1785.*

* The aerial troopers seen at Souterfell, were produced by the very same process as the spectre of Dover Castle, having been brought by unequal refraction from one

THE FATA MORGANA.—This singular exhibition has been frequently seen in the Straits of Messina, between Sicily and the coast of Italy, and whenever it takes place, the people, in a state of exultation, as if it were not only a pleasing but a lucky phenomenon, hurry down to the sea, exclaiming, “Morgana, Morgana!” When the rays of the rising sun form an angle of 45° on the sea of Reggio, and when the surface of the water is perfectly unruffled either by the wind or the current, a spectator placed upon an eminence in the city, and having his back to the sun and his face to the sea, observes upon the surface of the water superb palaces, with their balconies and windows, lofty towers, herds of flocks grazing in wooded vallies and fertile plains, armies of men on horseback and on foot, with multiplied fragments of buildings, such as columns, pilasters, and arches. These objects pass rapidly in succession along the surface of the sea during the brief period of their appearance. The various objects thus enumerated are pictures of palaces and buildings actually existing on shore, and the living objects are of course only seen when they happen to form a part of the general landscape.†

OBJECTS BELOW THE HORIZON MAGNIFIED.—In our own country, and in our own times, facts still more extraordinary have been witnessed. From Hastings, on the coast of Sussex, the cliffs on the French coast are fifty miles distant, and they are actually hid by the convexity of the earth, that is, a straight line drawn from Hastings to the French coast, would pass through the sea. On Wednesday, the 26th July, 1798, about five o’clock in the afternoon, Mr. Latham, a Fellow of the Royal Society, then residing at Hastings, was surprised to see a crowd of people running to the sea side. Upon inquiry into the cause of this, he learned that the coast of France could be seen by the naked eye, and he immediately went down to witness so singular a sight. He distinctly saw the cliffs extending for some leagues along the French coast, and they appeared as if they were only a few

side of the hill to the other. It is not our business to discover how a troop of soldiers came to be performing their evolutions on the other side of Souterfell, but if there was then no road along which they could be marching, it is highly probable that they were troops exercising among the hills in secret, previous to the breaking out of the rebellion in 1745.—“*Natural Magic*,” p. 152.

† The phenomena of the Fata Morgana have been too imperfectly described to enable us to offer a satisfactory explanation of them. The aerial images are obviously those formed by unequal refraction. The pictures seen on the sea may be either the aerial images reflected from its surface, or from a stratum of dense vapour, or they may be the direct reflections from the objects themselves. The coloured images, as described by Minasi, have never been seen in any analogous phenomena, and require to be better described before they can be submitted to scientific examination.—“*Natural Magic*,” pp. 155, 156.

miles off. They gradually appeared more and more elevated, and seemed to approach nearer to the eye. The sailors with whom Mr. Latham walked along the water's edge, were at first unwilling to believe in the reality of the appearance, but they soon became so convinced of it, that they pointed out and named to him the different places which they had been accustomed to visit, and which they conceived to be as near as if they were sailing at a small distance into the harbour. These appearances continued for nearly an hour; the cliffs sometimes appearing brighter and nearer, and at other times fainter and more remote. Mr. Latham then went upon the eastern cliff or hill, which is of considerable height, when, as he remarks, a most beautiful scene presented itself to his view. He beheld at once Dungeness, Dover Cliffs, and the French coast all along from Calais, Boulogne, &c. to St. Vallery, and, as some of the fishermen affirmed, as far west as Dieppe. With the help of a telescope, the French fishing boats were plainly seen at anchor, and the different colours of the land upon the heights, together with the buildings, were perfectly discernible. Mr. Latham likewise states that the cape of land called Dungeness, which extends nearly two miles into the sea, and is about sixteen miles in a straight line from Hastings, appeared as if quite close to it, and the vessels and fishing-boats which were sailing between the two places appeared equally near, and were magnified to a high degree. These curious phenomena continued "in the highest splendour" till past eight o'clock, although a black cloud had for some time totally obscured the face of the sun.

A phenomenon no less marvellous, was seen by Professor Vince, of Cambridge, and another gentleman, on the 6th of August, 1806, at Ramsgate. The summits of the four turrets of Dover Castle, are usually seen over a hill, upon which it stands, lying between Ramsgate and Dover; but on the day above-mentioned, at seven o'clock in the evening, when the air was very still and a little hazy, not only were the tops of the four turrets of Dover Castle seen over the adjacent hill, *but the whole of the castle appeared as if it were situated on the side of the hill next Ramsgate*, and rising above the hill as much as usual. This phenomenon was so very singular and unexpected, that at first sight, he thought it an illusion; but upon continuing his observations, he became satisfied that it was a real image of the castle.

This illusion derived great force, from the remarkable circumstance, that the hill itself did not appear through the image, as it might have been expected to do. The image of the castle was very strong and well defined, and though the rays from the

hill behind it must undoubtedly have come to the eye, yet the strength of the image of the castle so far obscured the back ground, that it made no sensible impression on the observers.*

Before we take leave of the "Letters on Natural Magic," we must give expression to our unfeigned surprise, and deep regret, that their talented author should have allowed his fine mind to have been blotted with such vulgar and sectarian prejudices, as he manifests against the Catholic Church. Surely, it was quite a work of supererogation, for Sir David Brewster to travel beyond his province, and boldly assert, without exhibiting one particle of proof, that the monks and priesthood of the Catholic Church, during the middle ages, exercised what knowledge they possessed of chemistry and mechanism, to impose upon the credulity and religious feelings of the people. We put aside the duty, imperative on every Christian, of not bearing false witness against his neighbour. As an eminent patron, however, of the inductive system of philosophy, which admits of no conclusion not warranted by an accumulation of well-authenticated facts, Sir David Brewster should not have promulgated an opinion destitute of proofs, and adopted without inquiry. Has he made good his accusation, by producing one single fact? He has not; and we dare him to the trial.

It has been a favourite practice with those who controlled our national literature, to attribute to the Catholic religion, the grossest abuses, which existed no where but in their own imagination or invention; and to load the Catholic hierarchy with epithets, as unmerited as they were vituperative. Such a proceeding was, in general, dictated either by an anxiety of securing the applause of the bigot, or the interested opponent to the civil rights of British Catholics. Or, by catering to the morbid appetite for coarse attacks, which characterizes the "vulgum pecus," the common herd of ignorant readers, to secure a wider and more lucrative circulation of their productions. Sir David Brewster should have rescued his name from the possibility of being identified, in aftertimes, with a class of writers who were guided by such unhallowed and such paltry motives. While,

* Natural Magic, p. 135, &c.

The phenomenon of Dover Castle, seen on the Ramsgate side of the hill, was produced by the air being more dense near the ground, and above the sea, and at greater heights; and hence the rays proceeding from the castle reached the eye in curve lines, and the cause of its occupying its natural position on the hill, and not being seen in the air, was, that the top of the hill itself, in consequence of being so near the castle, suffered the same change from the varying density of the air; and therefore, the castle and the hill were equally elevated, and retained their relative positions. The reason why the image of the castle and the hill appeared erect, was, that the rays from the top and bottom of the castle had not crossed before they reached Ramsgate; an eye at a greater distance from the castle, and in the path of the rays, would have seen the image inverted.—*Natural Magic*, p. 151.

however, we fully appreciate the talent and the science with which Sir David Brewster has treated "Natural Magic," we call upon him distinctly, to produce one single proof for hazarding the following assertion:—

"After the establishment of Christianity, the Catholic sanctuary was often the seat of these unhallowed machinations. (Those formerly practised by pagan priests, on a systematic plan of imposing on the people). Nor was it merely the low and cunning priest, who thus sought to extort money and respect from the most ignorant of his flock. Bishops and pontiffs themselves, wielded the magician's wand over the diadem of kings and emperors; and by the pretended exhibition of supernatural power, made the mightiest potentates of Europe tremble upon their thrones!"—*Letters on Natural Magic*, p. 57.

Dr. Roget, in his Gulstonian Lectures, read before the Royal College of Physicians, during the month of May, 1832, selected for his subject the Laws of Sensation and Perception. From them may be extracted the following remarks, as more immediately referable to the subject under examination.

Decisive evidence of the discordance between our perceptions and their causes, is furnished by the numerous instances which show the fallacy of those perceptions, and the errors we are liable to commit, when we place in them an undue confidence. Many examples of this kind were stated, in which fallacious perceptions arise, when certain impressions are made in an unusual manner upon the nerves of sensation. In particular, the effects of the transmission of the galvanic influence through the facial nerves, giving rise to the appearance of flashes of light, when no light is really present, were minutely detailed, as well as those attending the action of galvanism upon the auditory, the olfactory, and the gustatory nerves. It has been supposed, that in the last of these instances, where a peculiar metallic taste is excited, by including the nerves of the tongue in the galvanic circuit, a considerable part, if not the whole of the effect, arises from the actual presence of saline matter, developed from the decomposition of the saliva, by the chemical influence of the galvanism; but, this mode of explaining the phenomenon is incorrect; and among the reasons for rejecting it, is, that the effect succeeds the contact of the metals too instantaneously, to warrant the supposition that chemical decomposition can have been effected to the extent required for the production of the observed effect.

The judgments we form of the colours of bodies, are influenced, in a great measure, by the vicinity of other coloured objects, which modify the general sensibility of the retina. Many illustrations were given of this principle. When a white, or grey object, of small dimensions, for instance, is viewed on a coloured

ground, it generally appears to assume a tint of the colour which is complimentary to that of the ground itself. It is the etiquette among the Chinese, to employ paper of a bright scarlet hue, in all their epistles of ceremony. Dr. Roget was informed by a gentleman, who was formerly resident in China, that he for a long time, believed that green ink was employed for writing on this paper; and that he was much surprised, on discovering afterwards, that the ink was really a pure black, without any tinge of colour. In this case, the green appearance of the letters was an optical deception, arising from the tendency of the retina, impressed by the vivid red colour of the paper, to assume the action naturally resulting from green light, which is complimentary to the red.

A general law of sensation is, that the impression made by an external agent on the nerve of sense, continues for a certain time, after the action of that external agent has ceased. The influence of this law can be traced in each of the different senses; for it is found to extend universally to every case which affords an opportunity for observation. In the case of tastes, or odours, but especially in that of touch, it admits of being detected only when the impressions are sufficiently powerful. Ample proof, however, is afforded of its operation in the case of sound; for the sensation of a continuous musical note, arises from the regular succession of aerial undulations; the impression made by each, continuing, during the whole period of the interval, between two consecutive vibrations.

The influence of this law of sensation, is exhibited in the most striking manner in various phenomena of vision. The appearance of an entire luminous circle from the whirling of a piece of lighted charcoal, is a familiar instance of this general fact. In like manner, a fiery meteor shooting across the sky in the night, appears to leave behind it a long luminous train. Among other illustrations, the instrument contrived by Mr. Wheatstone, and termed by him the *Kaleidophone*, may be cited. It exhibits to the eye, on the principle of the permanence of sensations, the paths described by the point of greatest excursion in vibrating rods, which often constitute the most beautiful curvilinear forms.

The deception which takes place in the apparent figure of the spokes of a carriage-wheel which is rolling along the ground, when it is viewed through the intervals of vertical parallel bars, such as those of a palisade, or of an upright Venetian blind, is an example of the operation of the same law. Instead of appearing straight, as they would naturally do if no bars intervened, the spokes seem to be considerably curved. The two spokes which happen to be in the vertical position, are seen in their

natural shape—that is, straight; but those which are obliquely situated, appear to have a degree of curvature, which is greatest in those which are farthest from the upper part of the wheel. The most curious circumstance is, that the spokes on both sides appear to be bent with their convexities downwards; and this happens equally, whether the wheel be moving to the right or to the left, of the spectator. A certain degree of velocity of revolution is necessary to produce this visual deception; but the degree of curvature in the appearance of the spokes, remains precisely the same, whatever greater velocity is given to the wheel, provided it be not so great as to prevent the eye from following the spokes distinctly as they revolve.

A still wider field of inquiry may be entered upon, in the examination of the mode in which the physical impressions made on the retina by rays of light, collected into their respective foci, so as to form upon that membrane an exact picture of the surrounding scene, give rise to visual perceptions. The solution of the questions it embraces, involves the application of the laws both of mental and physical phenomena, and is embarrassed by an unusual complication of difficulties; for, in addition to those which are the ordinary attendants upon physiological inquiries, we have here to encounter more formidable obstacles, in the perplexing subtleties of metaphysics. It requires a strong effort of mental abstraction, in order to divest ourselves of the prejudices resulting from early association, and which have become so rivetted by long habit, as to constitute a second nature, and to be regarded as a necessary part of our mental frame. A careful and patient analysis of our visual perceptions, is necessary for the discovery, that they include ideas of space, which are derived from another sense, and which vision alone would be incompetent to convey.

The effects of the movements of the body, when rapid, and performed by revolving in a circle, in inducing a state of giddiness and disturbing our perceptions of the situations of objects, were among the instances adduced of confusion in our judgments, arising from unusual circumstances in the exercise of our senses. That we fail on those occasions in applying correctly the principles of visual perception, is also shewn by the strange appearance of a distant prospect when viewed with the head inverted.

Similar fallacies occur in our judgments of the position of objects with respect to the perpendicular direction, when deprived of the ordinary mode of estimating the direction of the force of gravity.

In the judgments we form, both of the distance and of the magnitude of objects, our inferences with respect to the one are

often determined by our previous or supposed knowledge of the other. Multiplied illustrations may be offered of this general principle, in instances both of natural scenery, and of the effects of various optical contrivances—such as telescopes, microscopes, and the phantasmagoria. The illusion which takes place with regard to the comparative magnitude of the sun or moon, when at the horizon, and when considerably elevated above it, is traced to the same law; which affords also an explanation of the mistakes to which we are liable with regard to the direction of the revolution of a wheel, or the sails of a windmill, when viewed obliquely. The idea we form of the convexity or concavity of a surface from its visible appearance, is determined chiefly by the supposed direction of the light which falls upon it, and is reflected to our eyes; and any error that we may commit with regard to the latter, is immediately productive of a fallacy in our perceptions of the former. Thus, if an engraved seal be viewed through a convex lens, at such a distance as to occasion an inversion of the image, the figure will appear to the eye to be raised, instead of depressed. Similar deceptions occur in viewing objects through a compound microscope, which inverts their images. In a picture, in like manner, the very same mode of representing an object may be made to suggest either a convex or a concave surface, according as the mind is led to conceive it illuminated from the one side or the other.

The illusions of our senses may be arranged under three heads; according as they are dependent on causes of a physical, physiological, or mental kind.

The first includes those in which an impression is really made on the organ of sense by an external cause, but in a way to which we have not been accustomed, such as the acoustic deceptions arising from echoes, from the unusual conveyance of sounds, or from the arts of the ventriloquist; the optical deceptions of the looming of the horizon at sea, the mirage of the desert, the *fata morgana* of the coast, the spectre of the Brocken, the phantasmagoria, the kaleidoscope, the suspended image of concave mirrors, and the other innumerable combinations of optical laws.

The second class comprehends those in which the source of deception is more internal, and owing to the peculiar conditions of the sentient organs, such as all those adverted to in the former part of these lectures, in which impressions are made on the nerves of sense by causes different from those which usually excite them. Ocular spectra of various kinds, the impressions on the eye and the tongue from galvanism, and singing in the ears from excited circulation, are among the many perceptions

which rank under this head. This class also includes a great number of internal sensations referable to the law of sympathy, and the endless variety of perceptive hallucinations arising from disordered conditions of the sensorium.

Of the third class of fallacies, including those which are purely mental, and originate in the errors of our reasoning powers alone, many examples can be offered. To this source of error all our senses are liable; but more especially those, such as vision and hearing, in the formation of the perceptions of which association exerts the greatest influence. Even the sense of touch is liable to deceptions of this nature; as in the case of the perception of two balls, resulting from feeling a single ball with the finger's crossed.*

While noticing the fallacious testimony which is so often yielded by the senses, it will not be inappropriate to refer to their almost perpetual inadequacy, and of vision in particular, when unaided by art, to assist us in detecting the stupendous secrets of nature, and of forming just conceptions of its wonders.

"No one, unaccustomed to explore the wonders of nature, would suspect that so simple a body as the crystalline lens, or hard central part, of the eye of a cod-fish, which he might suppose to be formed of a uniform material cast in a mould, would disclose, when examined under a powerful microscope, and with the skill of a Brewster, the most refined and exquisite conformation. Yet, as I shall have occasion to specify more in detail in its proper place, this little spherical body, scarcely larger than a pea, is composed of upwards of five millions of fibres, which lock into one another by means of more than sixty-two thousand five hundred millions of teeth. If such be the complication of a portion only of the eye of that animal, how intricate must be the structure of the other parts of the same organ, having equally important offices! What exquisite elaboration must those textures have received, whose functions are still more refined! What marvellous workmanship must have been exercised in the organization of the nerves and of the brain, those subtle instruments of the higher animal faculties, and of which even the modes of action are to us not merely inscrutable, but surpassing all our powers of conception.†

"Professor Ehrenberg has proved, that there are monads not larger than the 24,000th part of an inch, and that they are so thickly crowded in the fluid, as to leave intervals not greater than their own diameter. Hence each cubic line, or a single drop of the fluid, contains five hundred millions of monads; a number equal to all the human beings

* Abstract of the Gulstonian Lectures, read to the Royal College of Physicians in May 1832, by Dr. Roget.—From the London Medical Gazette for June 2, 1832 p. 274, &c.

† Roget's "Animal and Vegetable Physiology," vol. i. p. 59.

on our globe.* This able naturalist has proved, that even the *monas termo* possesses internal cavities for the reception and digestion of its food; and has rendered it probable that they have an organization as complete as that of the larger infusoria, such as the *rotifera*, in which he has distinguished traces of a muscular, a nervous, and even a vascular, system.†

"In examining the nutritive and reproductive functions of the infusoria, Professor Ehrenberg has been equally successful.‡ In order to display their digestive organs, he conceived the happy idea of supplying them with coloured food, which tinged the cavities through which it passed. For this purpose, he employed a highly attenuated solution of pure indigo, and disclosed the existence of a system of digestive cavities in all the known genera of this tribe of animals. These organs exhibit great variety in their form, situation, and arrangement; and though they differ in their degree of complication, yet this difference has no relation to the size of the animalcules. In the *monas atomus*, the minutest of animals, there are 'a number of sacs, opening by as many separate orifices, from a circumscribed part of the surface.' The *leucophra patula* has a long alimentary canal, traversing the greater part of the body, taking several spiral turns, and furnished with from one to two hundred blind pouches or cæca, which are regarded as separate stomachs; and hence these animals, which Lamarck and others called AGASTRICA, from their having no stomach, are actually called POLYGASTRICA by EHRENBURG, from their having more than a hundred stomachs!§ In some vorticellæ, one intestine, furnished with numerous cæca, makes a complete circular turn, ending where it began; and—'Thus,' says Dr. Roget, 'do we discover the same diversity in the structure of the digestive organs of the several races of these diminutive beings, as is found in the other classes of animals.'|| The same accomplished naturalist very properly remarks, that—'There is not, as far as we have the means of judging, in the colossal fabric of the elephant, any structure more complicated than exists in the minutest insect that crawls unheeded at our feet.'¶

"The grains of the farina or dust of the *Dodecatheon Meadia*, or American cowslip, when inspected with the assistance of a compound microscope, will be found to be particularly beautiful. They are distinctly organized minute pearls. So minute, that one square inch will contain of them upwards of three millions; and as squares cannot be covered by circles, more than one-fifth of the space will be left unoccupied; or to be more particular in numbers, presuming that a square inch will contain three millions of circles in direct rows each way, the area of each of such circles will be the 3,819,709th part of the area of an inch."—Maund's Botanical Garden, vol. i. No. 25.

"Both the different kinds of eyes which occur among insects, are to be found in the diurnal Lepidoptera. The ordinary, or compound eyes, are large and hemispherical, occupying the greater part of the head,

* Roget's "Animal and Vegetable Physiology," vol. i. p. 13.

† Ibid. vol. i. p. 186.

‡ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 93.

§ Ibid. vol. ii. p. 97.

|| Ibid. vol. ii. p. 98.

¶ Ibid. vol. i. p. 191.

and no fewer than 17,325 lenses have been counted in one of them. As each of these chrySTALLINE lenses possesses all the properties of a perfect eye, some butterflies may therefore be said, if Mr. Puget's observations are correct, to have no fewer than 34,650!"—*The Naturalist's Library*, by Sir W. Jardine; *Entomology*, vol. iii.—*British Butterflies*, p. 60.

"The mode of painting employed to produce those rich tints observable on a butterfly's wings, may not improperly be called a kind of natural mosaic, for the colours invariably reside in the scales, which form a dense covering over the whole surface. These scales are fixed in the wing by means of a narrow pedicle, and are most commonly disposed in transverse rows placed close together, and overlapping each other like the tiles of a house. When they are rubbed off, the wing is found to consist of an elastic membrane, thin and transparent, and marked with slightly indented lines, forming a kind of groove for the insertion of the scales. The latter are so minute, that they appear to the naked eye like powder or dust, and as they are very closely placed, their numbers on a single insect are astonishingly great. Leeuwenhoeck counted upwards of 400,000 on the wings of the silk moth, an insect not above one-fourth of the size of some of our native butterflies. A modern mosaic picture may contain 870 tessellæ, or separate pieces, in one square inch of surface; but the same extent of a butterfly's wing sometimes consists of no fewer than 100,736!"—*Ibid.* pp. 56, 57.

"The silken thread of a caterpillar is composed of two united within the tube of the spinneret; but the spider's thread would appear, from the first view of its five spinnerets, to be quintuple. On looking, however, with a strong magnifying glass, at the teat-shaped spinnerets of a spider, we perceive them to be studded with regular rows of minute bristle-like points, about a thousand to each teat, *making in all from five to six thousand*. These are minute tubes, which we may appropriately term spinnerules, as each is connected with the internal reservoirs, and emits a thread of inconceivable fineness."—*Insect Architecture*; *Library of Entertaining Knowledge*, p. 337.

"Leeuwenhoeck, in one of his extraordinary microscopical observations on a young spider, not bigger than a grain of sand, upon enumerating the threadlets on one of its threads, calculated that it would require *four millions* of them to be as thick as a hair of his beard."—*Ibid.* p. 339.

Talking of cellular tissue, Professor Lindley observes, "The cellules develope, in some cases, with great rapidity. I have seen *Lupinus polyphyllus* grow in length at the rate of an inch and a half a day. The leaf of *Urania speciosa* has been found by Mulder to lengthen at the rate of from one and a half to three and a half lines per hour, and even as much as from four to five inches per day. This may be computed to equal the development of at least 4000 or 5000 cellules per hour. But the most remarkable instances of this sort are to be found in the mushroom tribe, which in all cases develope with surprising rapidity. It is stated by Junghuses that he has known

the *Bovista giganteum*, in damp warm weather, grow in a single night from the size of a mere point to that of a huge gourd. We are not farther informed of the dimensions of this specimen; but supposing its cellules to be no less than the $\frac{1}{100}$ of an inch in diameter, and I suspect they are nearer the $\frac{1}{400}$, it may be fairly estimated to have consisted, when full grown, of about 47,000,000,000 cellules; so that, supposing it to have grown in the course of twelve hours, its cellules must have developed at the rate of near 4,000,000,000 per hour, or of more than sixty-six millions in a minute."—*Lindley's Introduction to Botany*, p. 7.

"The leaves of the Bujoor Palm of India, (*Coryfolia elata*) often measures thirty feet in circumference, and have a stalk to support them, twelve feet long; so, that if placed on the ground, one of these enormous leaves would be four times as high as a tall man. There is no machine of human invention, however extensive and complicated, which, can for a moment, be compared with such a natural apparatus as this, for wonderfully elaborate mechanism. Its digesting cells are infinitely more numerous than all the houses in London and its environs; and all the streets, alleys, and passages of that huge metropolis, shrink into insignificance, when contrasted with the myriads of ramifications of the veins of such a leaf."—*Botany, in the Library of Useful Knowledge*, by Lindley, p. 21.

That the senses, through their fallacious natures, which is amply demonstrated by these interesting examples, are utterly incompetent and inadmissible as faithful guides in any investigation on the mysteries of religion and objects of divine faith, must be readily conceded by every reasonable and well regulated mind.

It is true that our senses, when assisted by the auxiliaries of art, and instructed by science, are made acquainted with their own illusions, and acknowledge their erroneous conclusions concerning objects connected with nature. When illuminated by divine faith, and taught by religion, the human mind becomes equally docile concerning the mysteries of belief, and persuades us to subdue our reason into an obedience to the sublime, but inexplicable truths of revelation.

Of mankind, however, very few possess the means, or are endowed with the leisure and abilities requisite to work out for themselves, and arrive at those conclusions which are necessary for the correction of erroneous judgments of the senses. The canons of science, are consequently dependent for their credibility, amongst the great body of mankind, on the good faith of a few gifted and educated individuals. The learned deductions, the useful theories, and beautiful truths, drawn from these principles of science, are in reality, taken by the world upon trust. They are believed in, upon human faith; and assented to, by millions who cannot understand them. If therefore, the ingenious conclusions of the philosopher, however startling, however

seemingly absurd, however apparently incompatible with any thing like possibility, are, without hesitation, admitted by the unlettered, as well as by the studious and illuminated portion of mankind, it seems passing strange—a lamentable display of human weakness—for those individuals who are so ready of belief in matters enveloped in the obscurity of nature only, stand forward so obstinately incredulous about matters of faith, which must cease to be such, the moment they are understood—to become so restive in yielding their assent to truths, belonging to an infinitely higher order of mysteries—those of revealed religion; and to avow the legitimacy of rejecting an article of Christianity, because the human understanding, in its present gross and unenlightened mode of existence, cannot with facility explain it. Inexplicable as this inconsistency must always appear, it is however, mournfully exhibited in the conduct of many, whose separation from the Catholic Church, paternal charity compels us to regret with unfeigned sorrow. We are unhappily prevented from having the comfort of recognising them as brethren in the “household of faith;” if we cannot communicate with them in religious worship, “as sheep of the one fold;” as members of the “one faith,” it arises, on most occasions, from their refusing a credence to the doctrines of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. In this instance, they too closely imitate the incredulity of those who withstood and disputed with Jesus Christ himself in person, upon this very article of belief, which his sacred lips delivered to them. In the same precise way with the Jews of old, with the self-same arguments, the very same expressions, our separated neighbours at the present day *protest* against this doctrine of Jesus. “They strive among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?”* “They murmur at it, and exclaim, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?”† Instead of bringing their reason to a subjection to faith; instead of imitating the confiding piety of Simon Peter, who answered for himself and his brother apostles, “Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the word of eternal life;”‡ they emulate the incredulity of the first *protesters* against this doctrine; the first seceders from Christ Jesus; and “they go back, and walk no more with him.”§ They refuse their assent to a doctrine which he himself established.

* John vi. 52.

† John vi. 60-61.

‡ John vi. 68.

§ John vi. 66.

Art. XI.—*Summary Review of French Catholic Literature, from March to September, 1837.*

IN our Number for April, among the works which are enumerated, were several, not then complete, but coming out in numbers or volumes, published from time to time. These, it will not be necessary again to mention, unless some peculiar circumstances connected with their publication render it expedient. It will be sufficient to say, that the great collections of the Fathers, and of theological courses, continue to appear as we stated in our former article. Just before the expiration of the period to which our last summary reached, a new periodical appeared, which was overlooked in our list. We mean the *Revue Française et Etrangère*, undertaken by a company with a joint-stock capital of 100,000fr. The names of some of the editors, such as the Baron d'Eckstein, Ballanche, &c., give a ground of confidence in its principles, which has not been disappointed. The office is at 28 Rue des Grands-Augustins, Paris.

THEOLOGY.

Les Pères des trois premiers Siècles de l'Eglise. 12 vols. 8vo., 8fr. a volume. The first was to appear on the 1st of August, but has not yet been advertised as published.

Vérité Catholique, ou, Vue Générale de la Religion considérée dans son histoire et sa doctrine. Par M. Nault, ancien procureur général. This little work contains, in a compendious form, the Evidences of Christianity, as drawn from the study of man in his individual or in his social character. We have often been led to remark, the great superiority of continental writers over those of our own country, in the present age, upon this important part of theology. This is not the place to enter at length upon the comparison. The difference lies principally in this, that English writers chiefly occupy themselves with the external evidences, which assume more easily the form of a juridical, or, even a logical investigation, while foreigners lay more stress upon the proofs which result from the internal constitution of christianity, and its relations with the human mind and the moral wants of our nature. Such writers as Pascal and Schlegel, Bossuet and Stolberg, De Bonald and Windischmann, form a class of authors upon this subject, to which we have nothing to compare in English literature.

Le Christianisme considéré dans ses rapports avec la civilisation moderne. Par M. l'Abbé A. Senac. 2 vols. 8vo. 15fr.

Paroles d'un croyant, par M. l'Abbé De la Mennais, quand il était un croyant, retrouvées mises en Italien d'après le manuscrit même de M. De la Mennais, et reproduites en Français d'après la traduction Italienne. Par un chanoine d'Aoste. 8vo. 2fr

Reflexions sur la conduite à tenir dans le tribunal de la pénitence

par rapport aux Usuriers. Par un prêtre du Diocèse de Bayeux. 12mo. 2fr. 50c.

Manuel des Confesseurs. Par M. l'Abbé Gaume, chanoine de Nevers. 2 vols. 12mo. 5fr. or 8vo. 8fr. This is a useful and interesting work upon one of the most important duties of the Catholic ministry. It consists of tracts regarding it by St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis de Sales, St. Philip Neri, and B. Alfonso Liguori.

Des Rapports qui existent entre les sciences et la Religion, Discours prononcés en 1835 par Wiseman... avec Notes et Explications. 2 vols. 8vo. 16fr.

PHILOSOPHY.

Philosophie de la Vie, par Schlegel, traduite en Français. Par M. Guenot. 2 vols. 8vo. 14fr.

Philosophie de l'Histoire, par Schlegel, traduite en Français. Par M. l'Abbé Lechat. 2 vols. 8vo. 12fr. The character of these two works ought to be sufficiently known to our readers, that of the latter, from the admirable translation of it by Mr. Robertson; that of the former, by the analysis he has given of it in his valuable Introduction. We must regret that this has not been presented to the reader in a complete translation. The French, whom we are accustomed to undervalue as a light and superficial nation, especially in their scientific literature, allow no work of real value to appear beyond the Rhine, without immediately translating it into their own language. In our last notice, we mentioned a complete translation of the works of Stolberg. The *Symbolik* of Möhler, a work of far greater interest and use in our countries than in France, has been translated upwards of a year; and some other works of a similar character will be mentioned in the course of this Article.

Malebranche. 2 vols. 8vo., double columns, 24fr. The revolution which has taken place in the philosophical school of the Continent, and the complete rejection of the Lockian system, has replaced on the top of the wheel names, which, for a century, have been allowed to sink into neglect, and have too often been made objects of derision. Such is Malebranche, and we are not surprised that the French should wish to vindicate for their nation, by the publication of his works, its right to be considered the originator of systems which have been revived, in our times, as original and new. This republication of Malebranche, whose works in twelve volumes are now very scarce, is due to the indefatigable zeal and activity of M. De Genoude, proprietor of the *Gazette de France*.

Discours sur les avantages moraux de l'étude des sciences naturelles. Par M. l'Abbé Pouillet... directeur de l'institution de Saint-Vincent, à Senlis. 8vo. 50c. This is a discourse pronounced on the 16th of August 1836, at a distribution of premiums at Goincourt near Beauvais. The author, who was then professor of theology in the seminary of Beauvais, has ever exerted himself to excite in his pupils an enthusiastic love of nature and of the physical sciences. It is chiefly in view to the moral cultivation which results from those pursuits that he treats of them in this discourse. He powerfully rebuts the idea, that they tend

to render boys pedantic or self-conceited ; on the contrary, he shows how they are the fittest means for repressing vicious inclinations in youth, for producing a degree of modesty and distrust in themselves, inspiring a lofty idea of God and his attributes, and disposing the mind to receive revealed truths. The exhortation at the close is eloquent and pathetic. The *Temps*, a paper no ways suspected of partiality to the clergy, had an article a few weeks back, headed, "Improvement of Seminaries." It observes, that "courses of geology, experimental philosophy, and astronomy, are now opened at most of the seminaries of the kingdom ;"...and that this new spirit "will be of immense advantage to them by increasing their acquirements, and furnishing them new means of solace in the solitude to which they are often condemned. The country priest who becomes a naturalist, will be more useful to his flock, and less a burden to himself." We have in fact noticed in the French papers, constant mention of such improvements in various ecclesiastical institutions ; and would gladly see a similar extension given to natural studies in our own establishments for education.

BIOGRAPHY AND HISTORY.

Histoire de la Révolution religieuse, ou de la Réforme Protestante dans la Suisse occidentale. Par Ch. L. De Haller. 1 vol. 8vo. 5fr. The name of M. De Haller is well known to the English Catholic, as his account of his conversion was soon translated into our language, and excited universal sympathy among us. Having been, previous to that event, a member both of the supreme, and of the secret council of Berne, he has had every means of making himself acquainted with the religious history of his country : and in the volume just named, he has made a useful addition to the documents relating to the rise of Protestantism, by giving its particular history in the great focus of Calvinism. Zurich and Berne were the first places to receive the new doctrines, for they preceded Geneva in this lamentable step. The first declaration in its favour at the first of these cities, was in 1532, and M. De Haller's book treats of the interval between this date and 1550. The author is careful to quote on every point original authorities, above all suspicion. We hope, before long, to treat of the valuable work more at length.

Histoire abrégée et costumes coloriés de tous les Ordres religieux et militaires. This work is conducted by a society of ecclesiastics and laymen, who have taken for their ground-work the well-known history of Père Helyot. It is published in parts, each containing half a sheet of letter press, and a coloured engraving, for 1fr. Each engraving contains three costumes, and the work will consist of 100 parts, forming two large 4to volumes.

Histoire de la Papauté pendant les XVI^e et XVII^e Siècles, par Leopold Ranke. Traduite de l'Allemand par M. Haibert, publiée et précédée d'une Introduction par M. A. de Saint-Chéron. Some delay has occurred in the publication of this work, in consequence of the publisher's wish, after having advertised the two first volumes as ready for publication, to complete the work by the translation of the two last

added by the author. Ranke's work has produced considerable sensation in Germany, and has been chiefly made known in England by two articles in the *Quarterly*. We hoped to have reviewed it at length in our present number; we will not, however, allow a long time to pass without discharging our duty towards it.

Histoire d'Angleterre commençant 100 ans avant J. C., et se terminant à la réforme de 1832. Par M. Hercule Gallard. 15 vols. 8vo. Publishing in parts, one of which forming half a volume, appears every twenty days, at the price of 3fr. 50c.

Continuation de l'Histoire d'Angleterre du Dr. Lingard depuis la Révolution de 1688 jusqu'à nos jours. 6 vols. 8vo. 6fr. 50c. a vol.

Collection d'Histoires complètes de tous les Etats Européens. Publiées sous les auspices de M. le Baron de Barante, M. Villemain, &c.....et avec la collaboration du docteur John Lingard, de MM. Botta, Luden, Ashbach, Leo, &c. This collection will form from twenty to twenty-five vols., large octavo, in two columns. Three numbers are published weekly.

Cours élémentaire et méthodique d'histoire universelle à l'usage des collèges, séminaires, pensionats, écoles chrétiennes, &c. Par M. l'Abbé Giraud. 9 vols. 18mo. 7fr. 50c. This work consists of three parts, each contained in three volumes, and treating respectively of ancient history, the middle ages, and modern history.

Manuel de l'Histoire du moyen âge. The author of this important work, M. Moeller, is professor in the Catholic University of Louvain. His book is eminently Catholic, and ever keeps in view the advantages which the Catholic Church has conferred upon society.

Vie et Lettres de Madame de Cadrien, religieuse de l'ordre de Malte. We have here the life of one among the many thousands, who have done honour to our holy religion by their saintly life and conversation, yet have been little known save to God, and the few friends who surrounded them. Before the French revolution, the Nuns Hospitallers had a large establishment at Saint-Dolus. To the usual vows, they added, that of praying for the success of the Knights of St. John, in the warlike enterprises. Their dress was white until the capture of Rhodes, when, in sign of mourning, it was changed to black. In this house, Madame de Cadrien exercised every office of Christian charity, from the age of twenty to twenty-seven, when she died in 1730. Before entering into the religious state, she had been obliged to pass through the usual preparations which God requires of such as he calls to extraordinary perfection, by the sacrifice of wealth, and brilliant prospects in the world. What makes this biography particularly valuable is, not only that it is drawn up from original documents, which, till now, have lain in obscurity, but that it consists in great measure of letters written by the lady whose biography it contains. These are full of the most exalted sentiments of Catholic devotion, expressed in language at once noble, poetical, and original.

Abrégé de la Vie de Jésus-Christ, de ses doctrines et de ses miracles. Par A. J. Delage. 1 vol. 12mo. plates, 1 fr. 50c.

Vie des Saints de la Bretagne, par D. Lobineau, nouvelle édition,

revue, &c. Par M. l'Abbé Tresvaux. The work, when complete, to consist of five or six volumes, 5fr. a volume. The country of Britany seems ever to have been a fit theatre for great and romantic actions. Its worship before its conversion to Christianity, the piety of its first Christians, its noble deeds during the middle ages, and its heroism in our own times, have all a strong character analogous to the physical qualities of the country itself—"a land of granite covered with oaks." The lives of its saints were first collected together, often from traditional sources by Father Legrand, at the close of the sixteenth century. - His work breathes all the charming spirit of the hagiography of his age, simplicity of style, purity of faith, and unaffected piety. Dom Lobineau, a Maurist monk, went over the same ground a century later; but unhappily that century had made sad havoc with the qualities we have enumerated as distinguishing that of his predecessor. Lobineau was infected with the Jansenism of his times; he wrote as a critic: whatever was mystical or *legendary*, he rejected with disdain, and thus, he compiled one of those dry rationalist biographies, of which we have had too many examples in our own and other languages. M. Tresvaux has happily undertaken the task of remodelling his work, chiefly by the aid of Legrand's earlier work, and also from the chronicles of England, Ireland, and Scotland, in which the best account of Breton saints are to be found. By this means, he has produced a work, in which their lives will be restored to that charming form in which they originally appeared, corrected by modern critical refinement.

L'Eglise primatiale de Saint-Jean et son chapitre, Esquisse historique. Par M. l'Abbé Jacques. Lyon. Octavo. Lyons has lately been distinguished by a spirit of antiquarian investigation into the history of its sacred monuments. The Abbé Pavy is at the head of this study, and the author of the "two chancellors of England" has been indebted to him for important particulars connected with the life of our great St. Thomas. The work we have named is part of a larger one intended to illustrate the diocese of Lyons. It treats of the magnificent cathedral of that city, one of the most solemn and magnificent pointed churches in the world.

The Society "de l'Histoire de France," has been engaged in publishing the works of St. Gregory of Tours.

LITERATURE, POETRY, AND WORKS OF FICTION.

Etudes sur les Mystères, monumens historiques littéraires, la plupart inconnus, et sur divers manuscrits de Gerson, y compris le texte primitif Français de l'Imitation de J. C. récemment découvert, avec le nom de son auteur. Par M. Onésime Leroy. 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. 50c. The author of this valuable work is one of that "Jeune France," which forms the true hope of its country, overflowing with a fine healthy spirit in literature, not only purged of all the wretched taste of the last century, but inspired with fervent admiration for ages long past. The mysteries of the middle ages, the true drama of the Christian religion, though often mentioned, are but little known. M. Leroy has devoted himself to the study of them as yet existing in manuscript, and has communicated the result of his researches, under the modest title we

have given. The oldest of these compositions which has come to his knowledge, is "*Le jus (le jeu) de S. Nichole*," written in 1260, on occasion, as he shews it probable, of St Louis's expedition to Africa. A century later, we have a collection of seven pieces, entitled, *Mystères de Notre-Dame*, drawn chiefly from events in French history. In all these, there is great regularity and art, and a fine flow of simple religious poetry. The great master-piece, however, of those times, is the drama of the Passion, which embraces the whole history of redemption. Some scenes quoted and analysed by our author, will stand comparison with the noblest passages in *Athalie*. We expect a rich treat in this department of literature from M. Rio's work on Christian poetry. Mysteries are still kept up in some parts of France; and a remarkable instance of them lately occurred with extraordinary pomp at Dunkirk. The mysteries of Calderon are known to all the lovers of Spanish literature: his solemn and splendid drama, "*Devotion to the Cross*," was translated into German by Schlegel.—The second part of M. Leroy's work will be interesting to every lover of sacred bibliography. The book which stands first of all uninspired volumes, is claimed for Gerson, and M. Leroy thinks he has discovered in his native city, Valenciennes, the chancellor's original *French* manuscript. According to him, the work was first written in three books, and in the vernacular tongue, for the use of Gerson's sisters at Rheims, and afterwards recomposed in four, for the Celestines of Lyons.

Histoires morales et édifiantes. Par Madame J. Junot d'Abrantès. 2 vols. 8fr. These beautiful tales, published by the *Société des publications religieuses*, are intended to guide the minds of children to a love of virtue, and do infinite honour to the abilities and the moral feeling of their distinguished authoress.

Prasovie, ou la piété filiale, &c. This and three or four other little works are advertised to appear at the end of this month, (September,) and we mention them as specimens of the indefatigable zeal which prompts the Société Bibliographique to continue the publication of simple yet beautiful works for the instruction of tender youth. The same works as it has published, we see advertised by the *Société de Saint-Nicolas*, the origin of which is very recent. About ten years ago, the Abbé de Bervanger and Count Victor de Noailles, opened an establishment for the education of orphans from the age of eight to twelve, when they made their first communion, and then gave place to others. The separation at so tender an age was painful to masters and pupils, as the first saw temptation, and the last misery, in the first step so early into life. Hence, it was proposed to connect some useful trade with the institution, by which future means of livelihood should be secured to the pupils, who should likewise receive occupation in the house for some years longer. A printing office was chosen, as the young labourers could thus be beneficial to society at large, by the publication of useful works. The Society of St. Nicholas was thus established, funds were raised, the printing establishment of Didot, jun., has been purchased, and the undertaking has been placed under the direction of religious, practised in the art of printing. One of the chief

administrators, has been for years at the head of one of the most flourishing printing offices in Paris, and had a considerable share in it; but has given up all to devote himself to this charitable work. The Count de Noailles died July 22, of this year, after having brought this excellent plan into activity. The first work printed by the pupils, has been the *Histoires et Paraboles* du P. Bonaventure Gireaudau.

Poésies par Jean Reboul de Nîmes. Third edition. The poet is a poor man, who has sought consolation for the ills of life in his religion, and inspired by it alone, has poured forth his gratitude in verses full of pathos, energy, and approaching sometimes almost to the sublime. "Oh, my God!" he exclaims, "if I had not possessed poetry to give utterance to my complaint, and religion to console me, what would have become of me!" We would gladly quote one or two of the many beautiful passages in this volume, particularly his poem addressed to Our Saviour, did space permit.

A. M. de la Mennais Deux Epîtres. Par Désiré Carrière. 8vo. 1fr. 50c. Another youthful poet, full of genius and nerve, superiorly skilled in the use of his own language, who comes forward to vindicate his religion from the attacks of the unfortunate De la Mennais. The first epistle confutes the *Paroles d'un Croyant*, the second the *Affaires de Rome*. In both, but principally the latter, there prevails a tone of noble indignation, tempered with deep compassion for the once great name to whom they are addressed. M. Carrière, we believe, intends to do poetical justice upon another who has fallen away from his first faith, by the publication of a *Jocelyn Chrétien*.

Léa Cornelia. Par Anna Maria, auteur de *l'Ame exilée*.—*Sara, ou les heureux effets d'une éducation Chrétienne.* Par l'auteur Sidonie, &c. 2 vols. 12mo. 7fr. These two works by female hands, deserve to be classed together, as much from their subjects, as from the ability and pure religious spirit which they display. The first of them is intended to prove, that an education conducted upon mere philosophical principles, without a firm religious ground-work, prepares the way for a life of misery. The moral of the two is nearly the same.

Faut-il abolir l'esclavage? La religion Catholique peut seule préparer les esclaves à la liberté, et les faire jouir de ses bienfaits. Par M. l'Abbé J. Hardy. 1fr. 15c.

Encyclopédie des Connaissances Utiles. A number in 18mo., of four hundred pages, appears every twenty days. 1fr. 20c. a volume. To recommend this work, it is sufficient to see the list of contributors. Only looking at the first letters of the alphabet, we find the geographical articles by Balbi, the articles *Ame* and *Atheisme* by Ballanche, *Cosmogonie* and *Creation* by Baron d'Ekstein, *Conciles* and *Conclave* by Abbé Badiche. We are thus assured of the Catholic spirit of the work.

Encyclopédie du XIX Siècle. 4to. 7fr. a volume. The preface of this work, consisting of M. Laurentie's *Théorie Catholique des Sciences*, is a sufficient security for its principles.

We may here notice the series of publications under the title of *Maître Jacques*, each at seven sous. Two works come out a week; and the entire collection is pervaded by a sound religious spirit.

WORKS OF DEVOTION.

Opusculs de Drexelius. The works of this learned and pious Jesuit, will now be rescued from the oblivion in which the last and present centuries have left them, though, in better times, it is calculated, that 170,000 copies of them had been sold. This new edition faithfully copied, even to the ornamental title-pages of the older ones will be a valuable addition to the library of every Catholic who knows how to appreciate the simple and moving style of the old spiritual masters. The price of each volume is 1fr.

Les Vertus évangéliques, ou Conseils à Théodonie. Second edition, 1 vol. 18mo., 1fr. This excellent little book of instructions has reached its second edition in eighteen months.

La Douloureuse Passion de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ, d'après les méditations d' Anne-Catherine Emmerich... morte en 1814, traduite de l'allemand sur le deuxième édition. Par M. Ed. de Cazalès. Second edition, 1 vol. 8vo. 7fr. The abridgment in 12mo. 80 cent. Sister Emmerich was a nun at Dulmen, who, like many others in that holy calling, had been compelled to leave her peaceful retreat. Blessed with a spirit of divine contemplation, she was able to describe the scenes of Our Saviour's life and passion with a vividness and richness which no poetical inspiration has ever equalled. Her descriptions were taken down in writing by Clement Brentans, one of the first poets, if not quite the first living poet of Germany. He confined his publication, however, to the history of the passion, to which he added, in a second edition, which his work soon reached, her narrative of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. The French translation has met with as favourable a reception as the original had obtained in Germany.

Lyre sainte de la Jeunesse Chrétienne, ou petit Recueil de Cantiques, à l'usage des pensions, &c. 1 vol. 12mo. 1fr. 25c.

Le petit Jardin des Roses, et la Vallée des Lys, opusculs du B. Thomas à Kempis. 1 vol. 12mo. 1fr.

Anthologie Catholique, ou Instructions dogmatiques et morales sur les vérités de la religion. Par l'Abbé Huet. 1. vol. 12mo. 2fr. 25c. This complete course of religious instruction, has the sanction and approbation of His Grace the Archbishop of Paris.

 MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE CHOLERA.—*Rome, Oct. 3.* The cholera may be said to have now accomplished its frightful visitation of the Eternal City. Its course has been rapid but appalling; from the middle of August to the end of September, upwards of 12,000, some say 14,000, victims have been swept away. A noble field has thus been opened for the exercise of Catholic virtue, and we need not say that both the parochial and the regular clergy have done their duty. The curates or parish priests of St. Peter's and St. Charles's and the sub-curates of two other

churches, fell early in the exercise of their duty. Among the regulars it might be invidious to make any distinction where so many deserve praise, but the self-devotion of the Jesuits will not easily be forgotten. This zealous and active charity was not confined to the clergy, and all Rome has had occasion to admire the intrepidity and benevolence with which a noble Catholic Peer has laboured to assuage the sufferings of the poorest class. The various communities of British and Irish Catholics have, by God's blessing, escaped the scourge, with the exception of one not fatal case. One English sculptor of great promise, Mr. Burlow, and an English lady, Mrs. Vaughan, have been the only British subjects who have suffered. Another gentlemen fell a victim to the momentary fury of the populace; but he was the first and the last that was attacked in such a manner.

WEYMOUTH.—The Rev. Dr. Butler, Catholic pastor of this town, has lately delivered a series of lectures on the principal controverted points of the Catholic faith, proving the truths of our holy religion from Scripture alone. These discourses were attended by crowded audiences, and such has been the interest excited by them, that the learned Doctor has been induced to send his lectures to the press, and which accordingly are now in the course of publication every alternate Saturday.

CATHOLIC DIRECTORY AND REGISTER.—A new annual, called the "Catholic Directory and Annual Register," has been announced for publication early in December, which will embrace a variety of statistical details, including lists of all the Catholic chapels and their incumbents in Great Britain, and complete diocesan lists of all the parishes, chapels, parish-priests, and curates in Ireland, furnished in most cases by the Catholic Bishops of Ireland expressly for the work.

DIRECTIONS FOR MAKING A WILL.—(The following document has been circulated from the office of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department, among the clergy, and calls for the attention of the public.) "Directions for making a Will or Codicil, required by Stat. 1 Victoria, c. 26, § 9, to be observed after the end of the year 1837. 1. The will or codicil must be signed at the foot or end thereof by the testator. 2. If he does not sign, it must be signed by some other person in his presence, and by his direction. 3. The signature must be made or acknowledged, by the testator, in the presence of two or more witnesses present at the same time. 4. The witnesses must attest and subscribe the will or codicil in the presence of the testator.—*Principal Regulations for amending the Laws of Wills, which will take effect on the 1st day of 1838.*—No will made by any person under the age of 21 years will be valid. (Sect. 7.) The new statute does not alter the law as to the wills of married women. (Sect. 8.)—The regulations to be observed in making a will or codicil are as follows:—1. The will or codicil must be signed at the foot or end thereof by the testator. 2. If he does not sign, it must be signed by some other person in his presence, and by his direction. 3. The signature must be made, or acknowledged, by the testator, in the presence of two or more witnesses

present at the same time. 4. The witnesses must attest and subscribe the will or codicil in the presence of the testator. (Sect. 9.)—Appointments by will, under a power, are made subject to the above-mentioned regulations. (Sect. 10.) The testator's marriage is a revocation of his will, excepting in certain cases of exercise of powers. (Sect. 18.)—The revocation of a will or codicil may be by any one of the following means:—1. By a will or codicil executed in the manner above-mentioned. 2. By a writing declaring the intent to revoke, and executed as a will. 3. By burning, tearing, or destroying of the will by the testator, with intent to revoke, or by some person in his presence, and by his direction. (Sect. 20.)—Alterations made in wills must be executed in like manner as wills. N.B. The signature of the testator and subscription of witnesses may be made in the margin, or opposite, or near to, the alteration, or at the end of a memorandum, on the will, referring to the alteration. (Sect. 21.) Residuary devises in wills will include (unless a contrary intention appear in the will) estates comprised in lapsed or void devises. (Sect. 25.)

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL v. TODD.

Ursula Mountney by her will, dated the 16th of July, 1680, gave to Ralph Clavering and his heirs, an annuity or rent-charge of 32*l.* issuing out of her lands therein described, and subject to the annuity, she gave the lands to William Lord Widderington and his heirs.

By a paper of instructions, dated the 21st of August, 1680, after reciting the gift of the rent-charge, she proceeded as follows:—"Whereas, by reason of the malignancy of the times, I could not, by my last will, declare the use or uses to which I intended the said sum of 32*l.* per annum should be disposed, I did therefore give and bequeath the same to the said Ralph Clavering and his heirs; yet, nevertheless, my said devise was and is, and I do hereby declare the same to be upon special trust, and to the intent and purpose only, that the money arising and growing due and payable by virtue of the rent-charge granted to Ralph Clavering and his heirs, by my said last will and testament, shall be disposed of by this my writing under my hand and seal, I shall hereafter nominate and appoint. *Imprimis*, I do request and desire my honourable friend and kinsman, William Lord Widderington, that Stonecroft Numbush with the appurtenances may always be let to farm to some deserving Catholic, qualified to entertain a priest for the help of poor Catholics in Hexham and Warden parishes, and other places near adjacent. And whereas my dear brother, Mr. John Widderington, late deceased, did, by his last will, order and appoint that a Dominican or Franciscan priest should be kept at Stonecroft, I do hereby order and desire that the same may be performed accordingly, if a priest of any such order can be conveniently had. And I do give 20*l.* per annum to the priest that shall serve at Stonecroft for his maintenance, to be paid yearly out of the aforesaid rent-charge of 32*l.* per annum, at such feasts and days of payment as the same shall become due and payable by virtue of my

said will. And for the residue of the aforesaid sum of 32*l.* per annum, I do hereby order the same to be disposed of as followeth; namely, I do give 3*l.* a year to the poor of Warden parish; 3*l.* a year to the poor of Hexham parish; 40*s.* a year to the poor of Collerton parish; 20*s.* a year to the poor of St. John Lee parish; 20*s.* a year to the poor of the Corbridge parish to be paid yearly and for ever at such feasts or days as by my trustees hereinafter nominated and appointed to receive the same, shall be thought fit and convenient. And I do give 40*s.* a year for ever unto such person or persons as shall be employed to receive and distribute the 10*l.* a year to the poor of the several parishes above-mentioned, for their labour and expenses in and about the receiving and distributing thereof."

In the year 1693 William Lord Widdrington, the devisee of Ursula Mountney, convey the Stonecroft estate, subject to the rent-charge of 32*l.*, to Thomas Gibson and his heirs covenanted that he and they would pay the annuity of 32*l.* to the heirs and assigns of Ralph Clavering.

The Stonecroft estate continued in the possession of Thomas Gibson and his family till 1816, when Jasper Gibson, the then owner, conveyed it to trustees for sale. It was put up for sale in June, 1822, and in the particulars and conditions of sale, was described to be subject to a rent-charge of 32*l.* a year, and John Todd became the purchaser, subject to those conditions.

Up to the time of this purchase, it was stated that the 10*l.* a year had been duly paid to the poor of the parishes named in the paper.

John Jodd died on the 22nd of September, 1830, having devised the estate to William Todd, and made William Todd and Nicholas Todd his executors; and on the 15th of August, 1830, Edward Clavering, the heir of Ralph Clavering, the devisee of the rent-charge, conveyed and assigned the rent-charge to Nicholas Leadbitter.

The original information was filed *ex officio* by the Attorney-General on the 5th of September, 1831, against William Todd and Nicholas Todd, and against Edward Clavering, in whom the rent-charge was supposed to be vested; but, it appearing that the rent-charge had been assigned to Leadbitter, the information was amended on the 11th of January, 1833, by substituting Leadbitter as a party defendant for Edward Clavering.

The information prayed that the charity therein mentioned might be established, and that it might be declared that the sum of 20*l.* per annum, part of the rent-charge of 32*l.* per annum, was vested in his Majesty, and by his consent applicable to the purposes of the said charity, or otherwise at his Majesty's disposal by his sign manual; and that an account might be taken of the rent-charge of 32*l.* per annum, and that, if necessary, a reference might be directed to the Master to approve of a scheme for the regulation of the charity.

The Defendants William Todd and Nicholas Todd, by their answer, admitted that John Todd paid some arrears of 10*l.* a year given to the poor, but refused to make payment of the 20*l.* a year, insisting, as the Defendants then insisted, that the rent-charge of 32*l.* was, by the will of the testatrix, charged on Stonecroft jointly with other estates, and that the Stonecroft estate was chargeable only with a proportional part of the rent-charge. And they said, that if it should appear upon production of the paper of instructions, or any deed for establishing the charity or otherwise, that William Lord Widdrington lawfully charged the Stonecroft estate with the whole of the rent-charge of 32*l.* in exoneration of the other estates charged therewith by the will, they were ready and willing to account for the

same, and in all respects to act in the premises in such manner as the Court should direct.

The Defendant Leadbitter submitted by his answer, that the annual sum of 20*l*. part of the rent-charge of 32*l*., was payable to such Roman Catholic priest as was mentioned or provided for in the paper of instructions signed by the testatrix. It was proved by production of deeds, dated in the month of May, 1693, that William Lord Widderington charged the Stonecroft estate exclusively with the payment of the rent-charge of 32*l*. a year.

Mr. Kindersley and Mr. Heberden, in support of the information, said that as this information was filed before the passing of the act of 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, it was clear that that act could have no application; that the gift for the support of a Roman Catholic priest, being a gift for promoting a religion contrary to the established one, was void, but being in the nature of a charitable gift for a religious purpose, which could not be distinguished from a charitable purpose, it devolved upon the Crown to direct its application to a *cyprès* charitable purpose by its sign manual directed to the Attorney-General: *Attorney-General v. Baxter, Attorney-General v. Guise, De Costa v. De Paz, Cary v. Abbot*.

Mr. Lynch, for the Defendant Leadbitter.

In the case of *West v. Shuttleworth*, it was decided that a bequest to promote the knowledge of the Roman Catholic religion was a valid bequest; and in *Bradshaw v. Tasker*, it was held that the act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, which puts persons professing the Roman Catholic religion upon the same footing, with respect to their schools, places for religious worship, education and charitable purposes, as Protestant Dissenters was retrospective. The third section of that act provides that nothing contained in it shall affect any suit actually pending or commenced, or any property then in litigation, discussion, or dispute, in any court of law or equity. It is true that this suit was commenced before the passing of the act, but Leadbitter was not made a Defendant until July, 1833, which was after the act had passed, and so far as his interest is concerned, which indeed involves the whole matter in dispute, there was no pending litigation until after the act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, came into operation. If a bequest for the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion be good—and this cannot now be disputed—it seems impossible to contend that a bequest for the maintenance and support of a Roman Catholic priest can be unlawful, for the promotion of the religion being a lawful object, the encouragement and support of the priests, by whom that religion is to be taught, must be equally lawful. In *Cary v. Abbot*, Sir W. Grant, though he decided that a bequest for educating children in the Roman Catholic faith was void—a decision which, even at that time, may be considered as doubtful—made a most important concession for the purposes of the present argument, and that was, that there was no statute making superstitious uses void generally, the statute of 1 Ed. 6. c. 14, relating only to superstitious uses of a particular description then existing. The devise in the present case does not fall within any of the particular superstitious uses declared to be void either by the statute of Henry 8, or by the statute of Ed. 6; and, although it would have undoubtedly have fallen within the provisions made by the severe penal laws which were afterwards enacted against Roman Catholics, yet, as all those penal laws have been repealed, and as Roman Catholics are put upon a complete equality with Protestant Dissenters in respect to their religious

worship, a bequest for the support of a Roman Catholic priest is no longer contrary to the policy of the law. In the *Attorney-General v. Pearson*, Lord Eldon said that a trust for maintaining a society of Protestant Dissenters, holding doctrines not contrary to law, though at variance with the doctrines of the Established Church, was a trust which it would be the duty of a court of equity to carry into execution. And as Roman Catholics now stand, with reference to their rights in respect of religious worship, exactly in the same situation as Protestant Dissenters, there can be no doubt that it is equally the duty of this Court to carry into execution a trust which has for its object the promotion of the Roman Catholic religion. In *De Costa, v. De Paz*, Lord Hardwicke decided that a bequest for propagating the Jewish religion was unlawful, but that decision went upon a principle which does not apply to a bequest for the promotion of the Roman Catholic religion, namely, that the intent of the bequest was in contradiction to the Christian religion, which is part and parcel of the law of the land. The Roman Catholics and the members of the established religion go together to a certain point: both profess Christianity, and, in this respect, the doctrines of both are equally consistent with the policy of the law. In *West v. Shuttleworth*, the present Lord Chancellor, when Master of the Rolls, held a bequest to Roman Catholic priests, that the testatrix might have the benefit of their prayers for the repose of her soul, to be void, as falling within the meaning, though not within the letter, of the superstitious uses intended to be suppressed by the statute of 1 Ed. 6. No such condition is here annexed to the bequest, nor can the testatrix be presumed to have had any other desire in creating their trust for the support of a Roman Catholic priest, than the pious purpose of promoting the religion which she professed, a purpose which would now not only be lawful, but which a court of equity would be bound to see executed, and to which, by the act of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, the operation of which Lord Brougham has declared to be retrospective, this Court is enabled to give effect.

Mr. Pemberton and Mr. Wray for the executors of Todd.

The executors have themselves no interest in the subject of this discussion, further than that, if this gift was a fraud upon the law, and consequently void, it is their duty to contend that it ought not to be applied to the unlawful object contemplated by the testatrix. If this gift was in the year 1690 null and void, and if the testatrix herself was so conscious of its illegality that she resorted to a secret declaration of trust with a view to accomplish her unlawful purpose, it is a strange proposition to say that an act passed in the year 1832 shall have the effect of reviving it. According to this doctrine, every superstitious use which the law has declared void, every devise or trust which by statute or otherwise has been declared to be contrary to the policy of the law, and therefore void, would be set up and revived by the supposed retrospective operation of the 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115. There is nothing in that act from which it can be inferred that it was the intention of the legislature to give it a retrospective operation; no reason was assigned for the decision in *Bradshaw v. Tasker*, and the case does not appear to have been argued. The act of the 2 & 3 W. c. 115, contains a special provision that nothing contained in it shall affect any suit then pending, or any property which was then the subject of litigation, discussion, or dispute, in any court of law or equity; and yet it is

supposed that, by this very act, it was intended to re-open questions through an indefinite period of time, and to give validity to gifts which the law had for centuries declared to be illegal. When a person grants or devises an estate and makes a declaration of trust by the same or a different instrument for a purpose which is illegal, and which, in this case, the person declaring the trust knew to be illegal, the grantee or devisee will either take the estate discharged from the trust, or there will be a resulting trust for the donor, or testator, and the estate will go to the heir-at-law. In this case there is nothing in the unlawful declaration of trust which can possibly be converted into a charitable purpose. In *De Themmines v. De Bonneval*, a person gave to trustees a sum of stock to be applied in promoting the circulation of a particular treatise inculcating the supremacy of the Pope, and the deed contained a proviso that if the trust should be declared void, the trustees should hold the stock in trust for the grantor's executors and administrators. In that case the Court held that the trust had no impress of charity upon it, and was consequently not applicable to any charitable purpose, and that, as the particular purpose failed by reason of its illegality, the stock reverted to the grantor. Applying that principle to the present case, as there is no impress of charity upon the gift, the purchaser John Todd, and his representatives, would take the estate discharged from the illegal trust.

Mr. Kindersley, in reply.

The object of the testatrix was clearly charitable, though the mode in which she attempted to accomplish that object was illegal; and it devolves upon the Crown, therefore, to give effect to her charitable intentions *cypres*. Todd purchased the estate expressly subject to the trust; and there is no pretence, therefore, for contending that he, or those who claim under him, can take the estate discharged from the trust.

THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS.

Upon consideration of the paper of instructions, I think that the purpose of the testatrix in providing for the priest that was to serve at Stonecroft for ever was charitable, for her intention being that such priest should be a help to poor Catholics.

The intention being charitable, was the proposed mode of carrying that intention into effect legal? Before the statute 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, there could, I apprehend, be no doubt that the proposed mode of carrying the charitable intention into effect was illegal, and the Crown would have been entitled, under the King's sign manual, to direct the application of the fund to other charities in a legal mode.

Has, then, the statute I have mentioned any operation in this case? The information was filed on the 5th of September, 1831, against the persons in whom the property subject to the charge was vested, and against Edward Clavering, in whom it was alleged the rent-charge was vested. The Todds put in their answer in March, 1832, and stated their belief that the rent-charge was vested in Edward Clavering, which it had been, but was not at the time. The stat. 2 & 3 W. 4. c. 115, received the royal assent on the 16th of August, 1832. The information was amended, and Leadbitter made a party in January, 1833, and he answered in June in the same year.

The third section of the statute enacts that nothing therein contained shall affect any suit actually pending or commenced, or any property then in litigation, discussion, or dispute, in any of his majesty's courts of law or equity in Great Britain.

And although Mr. Leadbitter was, under a mistake, not made a party to this information, when filed before the statute, it is impossible for me to consider that this suit was not commenced, and that this rent-charge as against the property charged with it, and the persons liable to pay it, was not in litigation, discussion, and dispute at the time when the statute was passed, and I am therefore of opinion that the case must be determined, as if that act had not passed; and looking to that which I consider to be the established practice of this Court in cases where the purpose is charitable, but the mode of effecting it illegal, I am of opinion that it devolves upon the Crown to state to what charitable purpose the £20 a year is to be applied.

Mr. John Todd purchased the estate with full knowledge of the charge in 1822, and from that time appears to have refused to pay it; but I think that his estate, and the persons who have possessed the property since his death, ought to be charged with the rent-charge from the time of his purchase.

Declare then that the direction to pay £20 a year to maintain a priest to serve at Stoncroft was illegal and void, but that the sum of £20 a year was given for a charitable purpose, and that the same ought to be applied to some other charitable use; and that the appointment and direction of such other charitable use is in the Crown, and the Court recommends the Attorney-General to apply to the King for a sign manual to appoint and direct to what charitable use or uses the annual sum of £20, part of the said rent-charge of £32, and the arrears, shall be applied.

Take an account from the time of the purchase by John Todd: the costs of the informant as between party and party to be paid by the Todds; the costs of the trustee Leadbitter, and the extra costs of the informant, to be paid out of the *arbitra*.

END OF VOL. III.

ERRATA IN VOL. III.

- Line 3, from top of page 4, for *instructive* read *instinctive*.
- 1, at top of page 8, for *head* read *hand*.
- 16, from top of page 9, for *imitation* read *invitation*.
- 10, from bottom of text, page 13, for *which* read *what*.
- 13, from top of page 46, for *protect* read *protect it*.
- 4, from bottom of text, page 57, for *Protestantism* read *protestation*.
- 2, of note, page 71, for *another* read *the mother*.
- 21, from top of page 74, for *her* read *other*.
- 15, from bottom of page 78, for *fields, preaching* read *field-preachings*.
- 16, from bottom of page 161, for *Reekius* read *Heckius*.
- 12, from bottom of text, page 279, for *lungs* read *liver*.

INDEX

TO THE

THIRD VOLUME OF THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

- AERIAL** spectres in Cumberland, account of them, 536.
- Amusements** of the people, 117.
- Anapa**, port in the hands of the Russians, 229.
- Angler** in Ireland, 401.
- Anglican Church**, how to ascertain its real doctrines, 54—it does not receive those of the high Church party, 57—its article on the subject not satisfactory, why, 63—inconsistency of claiming a right to decree and not to enforce, 63—doctrine of Anglican authority a mere theory, 64—in the Catholic Church it is carried out, 65—the Anglican Church, in claiming authority, has no security of belief to offer in return, 67—it has no communion with any other Church, 68—Catholic Church is in practical communion, 70—Anglican Church allows no security even to councils, 71—authority and infallibility not to be disjoined, 72—arguments of high Church party applied to foreign Protestants, 73—mis-statement of Catholic doctrine, 76.
- Architecture** of London, 114.
- Architecture**, contrasts between ancient and modern, by Pugin, 360—why requiring a different character in Catholic and Protestant churches, 363—history of its progress in ecclesiastical buildings in Italy, 366—its golden era in England, XIII century, 376—how affected by the great encouragement of painting in Italy, 377—pointed architecture when introduced, and its progress in England, 378.
- Articles** of the Church of England, 517.
- Austria**, character of its Imperial Family, 207—education of its people, 210—state of its revenue, 211.
- Bacon**, Nicholas, account of him, 311.
- Balaton**, lake and monastery of, 213.
- Barrow** (Mr.), his tour and religious prejudices, 406.
- Becket** (St. Thomas à) account of him, 313.
- Beresfords**, the peculiar nature of their kindness to Ireland, 406.
- Botta**, his account of the dissolution of the Academy del Cimento, 157.
- Bible**, its various versions before the Reformation, 428—that of Douay recommended by the Church, 433—dangerous for indiscriminate reading without note or comment, 433—dedication of the English version, 434—Coverdale's bible, 442—prohibition put upon the reading of it by Protestants, 444.
- Bishops** of the Anglican Church not canonical, why, 522.
- Books**, dearness of, before printing, 430.
- Borelli**, 151.
- Bounties**, effect of on fisheries, 144.
- Brewster**, (Sir David) his unfair attack on the Catholics, 540.
- Brunelleschi**, his style of architecture, 381.
- Calcutta**, public buildings in, 115.
- Canada**, its difficulties similar to those of Ireland, 79—constitution of the Canadas, 80—the old French aristocracy displaced, 83—how replaced, 84—formation and defects of the councils in the Canadas, 86—system by which official

- persons provide for their families, 86—system of screening offenders against justice, 89—Government of Canada has no responsibility to people, 90—effects of this, 91—collision between their councils, 93—demands of the Canadians, 95—remarkable features of their financial difficulties, 96—Commission sent by Sir Robert Peel to enquire into grievances, 100—instructions, 102—address to the King, 103—state of the question at home, 104—Plan of Sir Charles Grey, *ibid.*—discussion in the House of Commons, resolutions, 107—Mr. Roebuck's proposals, 108—partly an extension of Lord John Russell's, 109—reception of the resolutions in Canada, 110—and consequent proceedings, *ibid.*—probabilities of an outbreak, 112—meeting of the political union in Canada, and their resolutions, 112.
- Canada, humane law respecting settlers, 456.
- Canónico de Jorio, well known to English visitors at Naples, his work, 3.
- Caraffa, calculus of remainders.
- Catholicism, prejudices no longer entertained against it as opposed to commercial prosperity, 175.
- Catholic clergy receive nothing from the state, 412—solicitude of Catholics to disseminate the original texts of Scripture, 437.
- Catholicism, its advance, 449—its great increase in England and Ireland, 450—its advances in proportion to those of industry and civilization, *ibid.*
- Catholic argument drawn from the fallacy of the senses, 548.
- Catholics aroused to take a part in history, 306.
- Cauchy's researches, 152.
- Cause of the Catholic Church that of liberty, 309.
- Centralization, 125.
- Century XIII., its importance and interest, 388—its literature, 390.
- Cesi (Prince Frederick), his history and patronage of science, 162—his acquisitions, 164.
- Chandler (Dr.), his account of the setting sun, 533.
- Chancellors, two, of England, 305.
- Chapels Royal contrasted, the ancient and modern, by Pugin, 361.
- Charity, amount of, in France, 188.
- Charlemagne, modification of architecture in his reign, 375.
- Christendom, work of Novalis, criticism upon it, and extracts, 284.
- Christian political economy, 165—political economy insufficient check upon the marriages of the poor, 170.
- Christian political economists, their notion for ameliorating the state of France, 189.
- Christianity re-establishing the harmony of human nature, 315.
- Christiern II., his savage cruelty, persecutions of Catholics, 447.
- Church, Anglican, in Ireland, its enormous revenues, 410—its abuses, 411—abolition of rates a great blessing, 412.
- Cimento, Academia del, 150.
- Circassia, travels in it, 198—its struggles, 220—their appearance described by Mr. Spencer, 221—residence of their chiefs described, 223—resemblance between them and the Greeks, 224—policy of Russia towards her, 226—their camp, *ibid.*—its commercial importance, 228—bays on its coasts, 231.
- Claddach, description of the fishing village of, 138.
- Coke (Lord), story told by him, 322.
- Conduits, public, their architecture contrasted, 362.
- Conscription, source of prosperity to working classes, 173.
- Coverdale, his bible, 442.
- Councils, Mr. Perceval's attacks upon them, 471—conduct of Catholic, concerning that of Lateran, 494—first general council, 475—council of Sardica, 476—that of Chalcedon, 481—of Constantinople, 482—Loadicea, 484—of Trent, 503—of Chalons, 506.
- Danube, steam voyage down the, its ports and commerce, &c., 198—success of the steam voyage down it, 200—its characteristics as a river, 205—effects of its navigation upon the political character of Austria, 206—mosquitoes on its shores, 215—British trade to the Danube, 217.
- Drainage Bill, Ireland, 421.
- Durham Abbey contrasted by Hereford Cathedral, 361.
- Duties on salt and timber, effect of, 140.
- Education, board of, objections that are made to its system, 415—greatly aided by the convents, 416.
- Electors, number of them in France, 127.
- Elizabeth (St.), history of her by Montalembert, 384—biographical account of her, 394—her charity, 396—her burial and translation, 399—parallel between her and Queen Elizabeth, 400.

Emigration, causes of it amongst the Irish, 453—numbers of emigrants landed at Quebec during the eleven years ending in 1836, 454—agricultural labourers, town emigrants, 457—career of the agricultural labourer, 463.
 England, her power to oppose Russia, 234.
 Eucharistic offering, Perceval's arguments upon the subject confuted, 484.
 European commerce, information given under that head in Journal of St. Petersburg, 235.

Families, proportion of to houses in different cities, 116.
 Fata Morgana, account of the, 598.
 Fisheries in Ireland, 133—early history of, 135.
 Fisheries, depressed state of, and its causes, 139.
 Fishermen, poverty of, 137.
 Francis (St.), of Assisium, his poems, and great perfections, 391—his order introduced into Germany by St. Elizabeth, similarity between them, their miracles, 392.

Galileo, 151.

German Catholic works lately published, 252—German literature, influence produced on it by Tieck, the Schlegels, &c., 279—improvement in its tendency, 296—direction of its policy, 297.

Gesticulation, the Italians converse by it as much as by the tongue, 1—description of some in ordinary use, *ibid.*—mostly to be found in the descriptions of classic authors, why, 3—further instances, 4—use made of signs by King Ferdinand, 9—use made of them in concerting Sicilian vespers, 10—they throw light upon the scenes on Greek vases, &c., and upon Leonardo da Vinci's 'Last Supper,' 11—the study of gesticulation might make an improvement in English elocution, 13.
 Ghelendjik, 231.

Hall (Captain Basil), his account of Irish settlers in America, 465.

Harbours, comparative merits of English and Irish, 27.

Headly, (Lord) his excellent system on his estates, 425.

Herschel (Sir J.) extracts from his discourse on natural philosophy, 532.

High Church principles revived, under what circumstances and by whom, 46—rules of faith laid down by them, *ibid.*—distinctions made by their supporters

between Catholicism and Anglicanism, 47.

History for several ages one long conspiracy against truth, 305—history of the forerunners of the Reformation, by Dr. Ludwig Flathe, 325.

Holland and some German cities the only European states where reading the Bible can have caused the Reformation, 448.

Holy See, attacks on it, 151.

Illusion, optical, Sir David Brewster's account of one, 533—illusions of galvanism, 541—of the sight, 542—illusions of the senses divided into classes, 544.
 Imitation of Christ, its beauty, 431.

Industry, its progress in England and on the Continent, 165—its apparent results are pauperism, 166.

Inglis (Mr.), his character as a writer of travels, 407-8.

Innocent III., his character and Protestant biographer, 388.

Ireland, sadness and obscurity of its history, 15—its ancient celebrity, 17—Moore's history of it, extract, 18—reasons why Ireland has retrograded, 20—extracts from Plowden, Sir Wm. Temple, Barlow, *ibid.*—England beginning to perceive her error, 24—agricultural and commercial capabilities of Ireland, extracts from Mr. George William's pamphlet, Shannon commissioners' report, 25—harbours of Ireland, extracts from report of Light-House Committee and Parliamentary return of ships, 27—dangers of English western harbours, 29—commercial advantages in resorting to those of Ireland, extracts, 31—Ireland might safely trust to her own future commerce, 35—her legislative prospects, 36—defects in the constitution of the Imperial Parliament as respects Ireland, 38—Irish fisheries, 133—tour through it by Inglis and Barrow, 401—its misery, its grievances, 402—consequences of the establishment of the Anglican Church there, 408—oppression its bane, 413—improved system of government, 412.

Irish, their excellent character, 40, 405—Irish in America, 452—the chief points where the emigrants land, 454—their condition on first landing, 455—greatly influenced by previous habits, 457—their political influence in America, 458—their affrays with the Americans, 460—their characters and conduct favourably established by jail returns and

- American newspapers, 461—their remittances home, 466—drunkenness rare amongst them, 467.
- Italy, its literature and publications, 247—minute analogies exemplified between ancient and modern Italy, 14.
- Jerusalem in one sense the mother of Churches, 481.
- Jesuits not the only revivers of religion, 292.
- John von Müller, Protestant historian, 287.
- Journals, French and English, their characters, 126.
- Kay (Dr.), quotation from, 118.
- Keble (Mr.), his sermon upon high Church principles, its texts and arrangements, 47—reasonably charged with Catholicism, 49—third division of sermon, whether or not Anglican ministers are endowed with supernatural grace, 53.
- Labour, its excess diminished by the Catholic Church, 197—its increase in Protestant nations occasioning pauperism, *ibid.*
- Land in Ireland, how much reclaimable, 418-19.
- Landlords, Irish, their atrocious policy, 417.
- Laplace (Marquis de), his *Théorie Analytique des Probabilités*, 237.
- Letters from an Irish Protestant, 428.
- Liberty, English and French notions of, 124.
- Literature, Catholic, German and Italian, 247.
- Literature, French Catholic, notice of it, *theology*, 550—*philosophy*, 551—*biography* and history, 552—literature, poetry and works of fiction, 554.
- London, journey to, by Montémont, 113 architecture of, 114.
- Luther (Martin), his Bible, interpretation of it, genius, 416.
- Lyncei, Academy of, 152.
- M'Gregor (Mr.), his work mentioned, 236.
- Magazine, Fraser's, reply to observations, 360.
- Magic, natural, by Sir David Brewster, 525.
- Manuscripts and apparatus of Galileo, whether destroyed, 159.
- Marburg, church of, 387—the town given up to St. Elizabeth, church founded by her brother, 398.
- Marriages of the poor, no moral check upon them, 170—encouragement given them by wages of children, 172.
- Martigny (M. de), mention of his narrative, 220.
- Martineau (Miss), her accounts of the Lynch law mobs, chiefly gentlemen, 459
- Maynooth, pittance it receives, 412.
- Medici (Leopold of), patron of science, 153
- Metradia, bath of, Mr. Spencer's account of it, 214.
- Method of least squares, in theory of probabilities, 246.
- Mirage, an account of it, 529.
- Miscellaneous intelligence, 253, 557.
- Montalembert (le Comte de), 384—extract from his history of St. Elizabeth, 385.
- Mont-de-Piété established at Limerick, its effect, 407.
- Montémont's London, 113.
- Morality, comparative, of London and Paris, 119.
- National Gallery, 114.
- Newton, his mode of discovering his system, 242.
- Novalis, his writings, edited by Tieck and Schlegel, 277—account of his biography, 278—his appearance, 283—studies and works, *ibid.*—his opinions and remaining Protestant prejudices, 289—comparison of him and Schlegel, 304—his miscellaneous thoughts, 299.
- Oaths, Catholic doctrines concerning them as stated by Mr. Perceval refuted, 493.
- Objects below the horizon magnified, 538.
- Oppression, the different forms in which it is the bane of Ireland, 413.
- Orange Societies, found their way to America, 461.
- Oxford, no Hebrew characters to be found there a century after the publication of the Hebrew bible in Spain, 451.
- Ozenam, his work on two English Chancellors, 305.
- Paul (St.), his voyage to Spain, 349.
- Paul's (St.) Cathedral, criticism upon it, 383.
- Pauperism, the result of commercial industry, 166—reason for this not increase of population, 167—but in that of labour, 169—our continental neighbours as badly off as we, 173—prevails less in Spain, and why, 186—religion the best remedy for it, 191.
- Perceval (Hon. Arthur Philip) his two controversial works, 468—mistakes con-

- tained in them, 473—his attempts to overthrow the supremacy of the Church of Rome, 475—his confusion between disciplinary and doctrinal decisions, 482—his unfairness, 490.
- Persecutors of the Church and heretics, their character and the argument drawn from thence, 488.
- Philosophy, irreligious of the last century, an account of it, 294.
- Physiology, animal and vegetable, by Dr. Roget, 525.
- Pictures, Perceval upon the use of them in the Catholic Church refuted, 486.
- Piers, the erection of, 144.
- Polyglot, Complutensian, its value, 437.
- Poor, state and number of, in France, 181—same effects produced by different causes in Ireland, 182—private charities for their relief, 188.
- Popes, their supremacy over Christendom, its effects, 319—their authority vindicated against Mr. Perceval, 479.
- Population, tables of, with a view to the state of pauperism in different countries in Europe, 179—different state of, in manufacturing and agricultural districts, 180.
- Portfolio, character of the papers it contained, 220.
- Portraits, apparent motion of the eyes in them, 535.
- Primogeniture, law of, and its effects, 131.
- Property, French laws divided it amongst the poor, 173.
- Protestant authorities on the subject of the Vaudois examined and refuted, 333.
- Protestant historians at length more just, 307.
- Public misery, its causes, 187—how affected by Catholic doctrines, 188.
- Pugin (A. Welby), his work on architecture, 360—attacks on him by reviewers, 365.
- Quarterly Review, its suppression of truth respecting Ireland, 404.
- Recherches historiques, extracts concerning the Vaudois, 341.
- Redout Kalé, 232.
- Reformation destroyed the political influence of the popes, result of this, 221—facts proving that it was not brought about by reading the Bible, 441.
- Religious institutions, an account of such as co-operated with the Jesuits, 292.
- Residences, episcopal, ancient and modern contrasted, 362.
- Roads, Irish, 423.
- Roget (Dr.), remarks extracted from his Gulstonian lectures, 541.
- Russia, her policy to the Circassians, 226.
- Russian influence in Circassia, 235.
- Sacraments, Mr. Perceval's arguments stated and refuted upon baptism, 496—confirmation, extreme unction, matrimony, 498—confession, 501.
- St. Brandan, imaginary island of, account of it, 525.
- Saint-Simonians, their school of political economy, 174.
- Sale of the Circassian women nearly abolished, 229.
- Salt, injurious effects of the duty upon it as regards fisheries, 139.
- Schlegel, his account of the 13th and 14th centuries, 288.
- Senses, their inadequacy as well as fallaciousness, proofs of this, 545—Catholic argument drawn from thence, 548.
- Sevastopol, Russian improvements there, 233.
- Shells, their appearances, 535.
- Sicilian Vespers, concerted by signals, 10.
- Slavery constantly prevailed before Christianity, 193—gradually put an end to by the Catholic priesthood, how and why they only could do it, 193.
- Soudjuk Kalé, its importance as a position, 230.
- Spencer (Mr.), extracts from his tour on the Danube, 201—4—name of his steam boat, account of his voyage, 211.
- Steamboats, prejudices of Turkish watermen against them, 202—their especial necessity in Greece, 203.
- Stephen of Belleville, quotation from him respecting the Waldenses, 329.
- Stuttgart, Library there, its large assortment of bibles, 436.
- Sunday*, 227.
- Sunday, as spent in Austria, 209.
- Theory of probabilities, 237—its utility, *ibid.*—objections made to it, 238—explanation of it, 239—two-fold object of the theory, 240—effect of the theory upon science, 241—distinctions drawn between observations made, and to be made, 244.
- Thomas (St. of Canterbury), cited before the Council, 323.
- Tides in the atmosphere, how investigated by Laplace, 243.
- Timber, duty on, its effect as regards fisheries, 140.
- Trade, its state and prospects in England, 185.

